

patriotism I have just quoted. In fact, the pattern of existence you have followed had its roots in history which dates back to the days when New Jersey was one of the leaders among the Thirteen Colonies which resisted the stamp duties and taxation imposed by the British Parliament.

New Jersey's representatives were active in the sessions of the Continental Congress which led up to the Revolutionary War. This province was a battleground for several of the most important battles of the War for Independence and carried its full share of the burdens of the war.

Some may ask why do I refer to the bloody and ancient days of the American Revolution? In addition they may ask, "Isn't the membership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars the outcome of more recent and modern conflicts and isn't our purpose to help bring some semblance of peace and security to our time?" We of the VFW can respond to those questions very quickly. We are constantly endeavoring to renew our faith in American ideals. We can appropriately turn to the old quotation which tells us that a man who has no regard for the past, has no concern for the future. We place a high priority on patriotism, Americanism, and the challenges facing all groups of citizens.

However, let us go one or two steps further with this theme. We know that no simple education in American history or in civics alone can defend an individual against anti-American ideals. In other words, no simple education in American history or in civics can defend an individual against the wiles of communism. Simply knowing how this country was developed and the dates the battles were fought, and that the Supreme Court and Congress and the President have different functions which check on each other, is not going to defend anybody. But knowing the whys behind our American institutions, knowing the meaningful version of American economic and political history—which must be taught primarily in schools—these things can first defend the individual and then defend the whole Nation.

A graphic illustration of what I am attempting to say is contained in the situation of the small boy who thinks everyone in the United States acquires a refrigerator, a washing machine, or a car simply by the process of living in the United States. What the small boy does not know is that the refrigerator, the washing machine, and the car must be paid for one way or another, either ready cash or the long process of a payment thereon for the next 36 months. But a lot of small children do not know that. They do not understand it at all. They think the whole system is a reflection of a new philosophy which says, "Get anything you want, get it right away, deny yourself nothing, discipline yourself not at all. Enjoy our wonderful materialistic comforts and rest secure; our country must be invulnerable because we have the best things."

I can summarize this philosophy by quoting a man who has had some thoughts about the subject. Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., who was the Commandant of the Marine Corps at the time of the Korean war, made a comment which referred especially to Communist-captured Americans who were grilled unmercifully during captivity. General Shepherd said this: "In the struggle against communism, war is no longer over when men are forced to give up. The prisoner-of-war camp is only another kind of battlefield. For they must be taught years before to carry on with the only weapons remaining to them; namely, courage and faith, and a sense of personal responsibility."

Ladies and gentlemen, the need to further the cause of our Republic will not be solved by magic formula. The best approach lies in an awakening of the consciousness of the Nation and of the individual—and that means you and me. Frankly, there is a definite need for a sense of conviction and dedication to our principles which exceeds that shown our enemy.

As some of you know, I returned from a tour of Russia's atom-research centers in the latter part of 1957. That will soon be 3 years ago, but the views that I reiterated upon my return continue to be basic and

vital to the prestige of the United States. Make no mistake about it, we must face up to Russia and recognize her ability to initiate and conduct worldwide propaganda.

During my visit to Moscow there was constant boasting about the Russian satellite, Sputnik I, which has been successfully launched October 4, 1957. The Soviets hammered at the point that the satellite was produced and launched by a Communist form of government. Furthermore, they asserted it was positive proof that Russia as a form of government excelled the United States. Mark you, Soviet science did not in 1957—and does not in 1960—operate on a 40-hour week. They work around the clock.

Ladies and gentlemen, our present concern with communism results primarily from the aggressive policies of the Soviet Union in the years since the close of World War II. The cold war between two giant powers, the United States and Russia, to control the future of the world creates a moral issue. As long as Americans are loyal, vigilant, and devoted, there is less danger of communism from within. We as a people must be willing to accept the responsibilities of leadership. In the cold war there is no quick or easy solution. Our loyalty demands that the United States should act positively to meet any Communist aggression; we must exploit Communist weaknesses; we must build relations of mutual respect with the rest of the world. Neither should we underestimate the resources of any potential enemy. Neither should we, my friends, underestimate the power of our loyalty to the United States. God forbid that we should ever underestimate the harvest we can reap—for the good of all mankind—if we neglect to practice loyalty ourselves, or teach it to the younger generation.

Ladies and gentlemen, our heritage of liberty and freedom has made Americans truly free. Therefore, let us resolve that as Americans we accept the challenge of communism by dedicating ourselves to that type of patriotism which has established for all Americans a Nation of free men and women.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1960

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rabbi David H. Panitz, of Temple Emanuel, Paterson, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, we convene again in this august Chamber with an awareness of Thy presence and with a firm resolve to make ourselves instruments for the fulfillment of Thy will. We know that our purpose on earth is only achieved by obedience to Thy message and by the acknowledgment of Thy sovereignty in all spheres of life. The mantle of leadership imposes inexorable responsibilities to deliberate and act with broad vision, with a love for all mankind, and with a sensitive devotion to the loftiest horizons of American democracy. We pray for the inner strength that will enable Thy servants to quest fearlessly for truth, to fashion the future with optimism, and to perform decisive deeds for the peace of our Nation and the world. May we be worthy of Thy continued blessings, O Master of all creation, as we manifest the wisdom and courage to make ourselves and our country exem-

plars of righteousness in the sight of all peoples, and as we mold ourselves and these United States into a potent force for moral rectitude in the sight of all the nations.

May we never shirk opportunities to unite all our citizenry into a bond of true brotherhood, nor eschew the prudent occasions and methods to draw together the hearts of all Thy children who inhabit this globe. May we never hesitate to defend the dignity of man and the sanctity of life for all who have been created in Thine image. May we learn to share with others the gifts of the earth and of human insight with which we have been abundantly endowed. May we ever find in service to exalted ideals the protection of our Nation's interests and the achievement of amity among the sons of men.

By our deeds of uprightness, compassion, and faith, we pray for Thy providential blessing: May the Lord bless you and protect you; may the Lord cause His countenance to shine upon you and may He be gracious unto you; may He lift up His face unto you and grant you peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading

of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 25, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1751) to place in trust status certain lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour, and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes. The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. DIRKSEN, and by unanimous consent, the Monopoly and Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON AGREEMENTS CONCLUDED UNDER AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on agreements concluded during March 1960 under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, with the Governments of India, Finland, and United Arab Republic (Egypt) (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON MILITARY PROCUREMENT ACTIONS FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK NEGOTIATED IN THE INTEREST OF NATIONAL DEFENSE OR INDUSTRIAL MOBILIZATION

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military procurement actions for experimental, developmental, or research work negotiated in the interest of national defense or industrial mobilization, for the period July-December 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO PERMANENT DUTY AT THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Deputy Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that, as of March 31, 1960, there was an aggregate of 2,462 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPEAL OF ACT RELATING TO CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND BY THE UNITED STATES TO STATE OF WISCONSIN

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the act of May 29, 1958, which au-

thorized and directed the Administrator of General Services to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations contained in an instrument conveying certain land by the United States to the State of Wisconsin (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON MILITARY PRIME CONTRACTS WITH BUSINESS FIRMS IN THE UNITED STATES FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, AND RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military prime contracts with business firms in the United States for experimental, developmental, and research work, during the month of February 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 7 OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES ACT OF 1946, RELATING TO TRAVEL COST FOR CERTAIN PERSONS

A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the United States, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF POLICIES AND PRACTICES REGARDING UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PAYMENTS TO RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of policies and practices regarding unemployment compensation payments to retired Federal employees, Department of Labor, June 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED ACTIVITIES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF AMERICAN SAMOA

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected activities of the Government of American Samoa, Office of Territories, Department of the Interior, dated April 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED COMMERCIAL AIR SHIPMENTS OF HOUSEHOLD GOODS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected commercial air shipments of household goods of military personnel, dated April 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION CONTRACT WITH NATIONAL LEAD CO.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on General Services Administration contract DMP-131, with National Lead Co., New York, N.Y., dated April 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON THEODORE ROOSEVELT CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission, dated February 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 2455 OF REVISED STATUTES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation

to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands in its 1958 regular and special sessions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF WAR-RISK INSURANCE AND CERTAIN MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of March 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution signed by E. E. Hagan, and sundry other citizens of Natchez, Miss., favoring the enactment of legislation to regulate organized labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Corda C. Cox, of Springfield, Mo., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment: S. 3072. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the payment of certain claims against the United States (Rept. No. 1294).

By Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment:

H.R. 8289. An act to accelerate the commencing date of civil service retirement annuities, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1295).

By Mr. HENNING, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 92. Concurrent resolution creating a Joint Committee on Arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and the Vice President-elect on January 20, 1961.

REPORT ENTITLED "SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT—1960" (S. REPT. NO. 1293)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, at the request of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, and on his behalf, I submit to the Senate a committee report entitled "Small Business Investment Act—1960," and ask that it be printed.

I wish to add that this report contains findings and recommendations of the committee for improving the effectiveness of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. The Senator from Alabama, and others of us on the committee, expect to introduce legislation in the near future to carry out the committee's aims.

I am also happy to say that this report is a unanimous one—enjoying the support of all the committee members.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS FOR INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT-ELECT AND VICE-PRESIDENT-ELECT ON JANUARY 20, 1961

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, earlier today, Senate Concurrent Resolution 92, which I submitted, and which creates a Joint Committee on Arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and the Vice President-elect on January 20, 1961, has been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration.

It is important that this concurrent resolution be adopted. It has been delayed. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 92) creating a Joint Committee on Arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect on January 20, 1961.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 92) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a joint committee consisting of three Senators and three Representatives, to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, is authorized to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice-President-elect of the United States on the 20th day of January 1961.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive J, 86th Congress, 1st session, a Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, dated at Geneva April 29, 1958, and signed on behalf of the United States of America on September 15, 1958 (Ex. Rept. No. 5);

Executive K, 86th Congress, 1st session, a Convention on the High Seas, dated at Geneva April 29, 1958, and signed on behalf of the United States of America on September 15, 1958 (Ex. Rept. No. 5);

Executive L, 86th Congress, 1st session, an Agreement entitled "Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas," adopted by the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea at Geneva on April 29, 1958 (Ex. Rept. No. 5);

Executive M, 86th Congress, 1st session, a Convention on the Continental Shelf, dated at Geneva April 29, 1958, and signed on behalf of the United States of America on September 15, 1958 (Ex. Rept. No. 5); and

Executive N, 86th Congress, 1st session, an Optional Protocol of Signature Concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, dated at Geneva April 29, 1958, and signed on behalf of the United States of America on September 15, 1958 (Ex. Rept. No. 5).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 3426. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Don Lund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROUTY:

S. 3427. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, to make benefits more realistic in terms of present wage rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. (See the remarks of Mr. PROUTY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 3428. A bill for the relief of Wilhelmina Sophia DeBruyne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3429. A bill to amend section 216(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to permit the appointment of U.S. nationals to the Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KERR:

S. 3430. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Act of 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3431. A bill to authorize the modification for future water supply purposes of the project for flood control in the Red-Ouachita River Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 3432. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Briganti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 3433. A bill giving the consent of Congress to a compact between the State of Arizona and the State of Nevada establishing a boundary between those States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 3434. A bill to facilitate the selection by Alaska pursuant to the act of July 7, 1958, of certain public lands under outstanding mineral lease or permit; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 3435. A bill to clarify the rights of States to select certain public lands subject to any outstanding mineral lease or permit; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, to make benefits more realistic in terms of present wage rates and for other purposes.

The primary aim of the bill is to increase the benefits afforded by existing law to employees of the Federal Government, other than military personnel, who are injured in the performance of

their duties and the dependents of those who died as a result of such injuries.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an explanation of the bill and a section by section summary discussion of its provisions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation of the bill and section by section summary discussion will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3427) to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, to make benefits more realistic in terms of present wage rates, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PROUTY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. PROUTY is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT AS AMENDED

Under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act the amount of compensation paid for disability and death is computed on the basis of the monthly pay received by an injured employee at the time of injury. As a result, compensation payments to beneficiaries on account of injuries sustained in prior years fail to reflect the sharp rise in pay and living costs in recent years and are substantially less than benefits paid on present wage levels. Approximately 50 percent of the 8,200 cases of permanent or long-continuing disability and more than 76 percent of the 5,000 death cases in which benefits are presently being paid occurred prior to 1951. In nearly 16 percent of these cases the injury occurred prior to World War II and in 26 percent of these cases the injury occurred during the war years 1941-45.

To deal equitably with employees and their dependents whose wage base (i.e., the monthly pay at the time of injury), is geared to an old rate of pay, it is necessary to provide specifically for them. The amendments to the Federal Employees Compensation Act enacted in 1949 dealt with this problem by increasing the wage base by 40 percent, if the injury occurred before January 1, 1941, or by 10 percent if the injury occurred on or after that date but before July 1, 1946. However, the substantial increase in rates of pay since 1946 and the rise in living costs since that time make a further increase in the wage base necessary to provide equitable treatment for employees injured in prior years and their dependents. To provide for such employees and their dependents this bill would increase by 10 percent the wage base used to compute the amount of compensation for disability or death if the injury for which compensation is payable occurred before January 1, 1958.

The bill would also increase the minimum amount of compensation for total disability from \$112.50 to \$150 per month except in cases where the monthly pay of the injured employee is less than \$150, in which event—as under the act at the present time—the compensation for total disability would be equal to the full monthly pay of the injured employee.

In addition, the bill would increase (1) the minimum wage base to be used in determining the amount of compensation to be paid in death cases from \$150 to \$200, (2) the amount available for burial expenses to the beneficiaries of an employee whose death resulted from an injury sustained in the performance of his duties, (3) the maximum amount allowable for the services of an attendant in those cases where the employee is so helpless as to require such con-

stant service, and (4) the maximum allowance payable for the maintenance of an employee who is undergoing rehabilitation pursuant to the direction of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation.

The bill would also increase the benefits being paid in approximately 1,100 fatal and 200 total disability cases which arose out of various Federal emergency relief programs in operation between 1934 and 1942. The benefits presently being paid in these cases, which are governed by the provisions of the act of February 15, 1934, are pitifully small. The beneficiaries in the fatal cases, who are almost exclusively widows, most of whom are well advanced in years, now receive on an average of \$30 per month, and the compensation rate in many of the total disability cases is less than \$100 per month. This bill would authorize a minimum compensation rate of \$100 per month for the total disability cases and compensation at the rate of \$52.50 per month for widows.

The bill contains a number of technical amendments and refinements to facilitate and make more equitable the administration of the act. Principal among these are amendments: (1) authorizing payment of compensation for scheduled disability in addition to benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act, (2) requiring election of benefits in any case where the claimant for compensation also is eligible to receive certain payments or benefits from the United States for the same disability or death, (3) authorizing medical care to those employees who after sustaining compensable injuries are required to make an election and elect to receive their retirement annuity, (4) providing an additional method for computing the amount of compensation in certain cases of disability and recurring disability, (5) extending the time period for giving notice of injury and filing claim for compensation in cases of latent disability and, (6) assuring Government employees required to appear as parties or witnesses in the prosecution of third-party cases that they will be treated as in active duty status while so engaged.

The bill also includes a proposal designed to further the promotion of safety in the various Federal agencies and establishments by requiring all Federal agencies to include in their annual budget estimates a request for funds to repay the Employees' Compensation Fund for the costs of benefits paid during the preceding fiscal year on account of the injury or death of employees under the jurisdiction of each such agency.

A summary discussion of the bill by title and section follows:

Section 1 of the bill provides a short title for the legislation, the "Federal Employees' Compensation Act Amendments of 1960."

Section 101: This section amends (1) section 6(b)(1) of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to increase the maximum allowance for the service of an attendant from \$75 to \$125 per month, (2) section 6(b)(2) of the act to increase from \$50 to \$100 per month the maximum allowance payable for the maintenance of a disabled employee undergoing vocational rehabilitation at the direction of the Bureau, and (3) section 6(c) of the act to increase the minimum amount of compensation in cases of total disability from \$112.50 to \$150.

There are few cases in which an injured person is so helpless as to require the constant service of an attendant. However, where this need does exist, the present allowance of \$75 is wholly inadequate.

The existing maximum allowance payable for the maintenance of a disabled employee undergoing vocational rehabilitation at the direction of the Bureau is inadequate. The proposed new maximum is approximately the same as the maintenance allowance authorized under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

The increase in the minimum compensation rate for cases of total disability is applicable, as are the other amendments to the Federal Employees' Compensation Act contained in this section, to cases already on the rolls as well as prospectively. The effect of this provision will be to assure a minimum compensation rate of \$150 in total disability cases in which the monthly pay of the injured employee (including adjustments in the monthly pay in old cases made by this act and the Federal Employees' Compensation Act Amendments of 1949) is equal to at least \$150. If the monthly pay of the totally disabled employee is less than \$150, the rate of compensation, as under the act at present, will be equal to his full monthly pay.

Section 102: This section will increase the minimum wage base to be used in determining the amount of compensation to be paid in death cases from \$150 to \$200.

Section 103: This section increases the maximum allowance for burial expenses from \$400 to \$800. The present maximum allowance for burial expenses is wholly inadequate and in many cases the family of the deceased employee is required to bear the expense of a major part of the cost of a modest burial.

Section 104: This section increases by 10 percent the monthly pay upon the basis of which compensation for disability or death is computed under the Federal Employee's Compensation Act, as amended, for every employee as defined in section 40(b)(1) or (2) of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, if such employee's injury (or injury causing death) occurred before January 1, 1958. The section explicitly provides that nothing in this or any other act of Congress shall be construed to make the increase in the monthly pay provided by this section applicable to military personnel, or any person or employee not within the definition of section 40(b)(1) or (2) of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. The section also explicitly provides that the increase in the monthly pay authorized is applicable only with respect to any period beginning on or after the first date of the first calendar month following the enactment of this act and shall not be construed to permit the amount of compensation paid on account of an employee's disability or death to be increased more than 10 percent.

The increase in the wage base authorized by this section will be applied to all cases on the rolls to which this section is applicable before the increase in the minimum wage base for computing death benefits authorized by section 102 of this act and the increase in the minimum compensation rate in total disability cases authorized by section 101 of this act is applied.

Section 105: This section will increase the benefits now being paid under the provisions of the act of February 15, 1934, in approximately 1,100 fatal and 200 total disability cases which arose out of various Federal emergency relief programs in operation between 1934 and 1942.

The increase in benefits would be accomplished by raising the monthly pay on the basis of which compensation for disability or death is computed in these cases from \$75 to \$150. This will result in a minimum compensation rate of \$100 per month for the permanent total disability cases, the great majority of which presently receive considerably less than that amount, and compensation at the rate of \$52.50 for the widows in death cases who presently received an average of \$30 per month.

TITLE II. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

Section 201: This section amends section 7 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to permit the payment of compensation for scheduled permanent disability specified

in subsection 5(a) of the act in addition to benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act. At present such compensation and benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act may not be paid for the same period of time.

At present an employee who suffers an injury which entitles him to a scheduled award may receive the compensation provided by the Federal Employees' Compensation Act for that injury although he returns to full-time duty without any loss in pay. It is inequitable to force an employee who is eligible to and elects to retire after sustaining such an injury to forego the compensation provided by the Federal Employees' Compensation Act for the schedule loss.

In addition, this section amends the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to require an election of benefits in any case in which a claimant for compensation is eligible to receive any payment for benefits from the United States by reason of the same disability or death. A small number of cases have occurred in which the Bureau has found that the disability or death of an employee has resulted from an injury sustained in civilian employment by the United States and the Veterans' Administration has held that the same disability or death was caused by military service. As a result, the United States has paid compensation twice for the same disability or death. This amendment is intended to prevent payment of dual benefits in such cases in the future.

Section 202: This section amends the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to permit the furnishing of medical care under the act to an employee who after sustaining a compensable injury elects to receive a civil service retirement annuity for which he is eligible. The present prohibition against payment of compensation and retirement benefits for the same period of time precludes the furnishing of medical care in such cases unless the beneficiary elects to receive compensation benefits in lieu of the annuity for the period he is under medical care.

Section 203: This section would amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to make clear that the statutory period within which an employee is required to file a claim for compensation in cases of latent disability does not begin to run until the employee has a compensable disability and is aware, or by the exercise of reasonable diligence should have been aware, of the causal relationship of the compensable disability and his employment.

One of the major problems affecting the payment of compensation in cases of latent disability is the statutory requirement regarding the time within which the employee must file a claim for benefits. An employee may not know that he is suffering from a radiation disease, for example, for many years after the date of exposure. Even after he becomes aware of the existence of some such injury, it may be years before he becomes unable to continue his work, and under a disability for which he is entitled to receive compensation. Yet, his failure to file a claim may, because of the statutory requirements regarding the time within which a claim must be filed, defeat his right to compensation after the disability arises.

To protect employees in such cases, it is necessary that the statutory period after which a claim is barred not begin to run until the date the employee suffers disability and knew, or by the exercise of reasonable diligence should have known, of its existence and its causal relationship to his employment.

However, even when there is no disability upon which to base a claim for compensation, notice of the injury should be given by the employee as soon as he knows of its existence, so that the first opportunity to investigate the potential claim is not lost. For this reason, the statutory requirement

of notice of injury established by this section for cases of latent or undiscovered disability is not conditioned upon the existence of any disability. It applies as soon as the employee is aware or in the exercise of reasonable diligence should have been aware that his condition is causally related to his employment, regardless of whether or not there is a compensable disability.

Section 204: This section would make it a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of not more than \$500 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both, for an officer or employee of the United States, charged with responsibility for making reports of injuries, to willfully fail or neglect to make such a report, or to induce an employee to forego filing a claim, or to willfully retain any notice required to be filed under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

Section 205: This section would insure that Government employees will be treated as in an active duty status when they must appear as parties or witnesses in third-party cases which the Government has required to be prosecuted by, and in the name of, an injured employee.

Existing law does not make clear the authority of a Government agency to carry an employee who is a party or witness to such a proceeding in an active duty status while he is attending court proceedings. Existing statutory provisions concerning the status of Government employees required to appear in legal proceedings deal only with those employees summoned to appear as a witness on behalf of the United States and the District of Columbia in actions to which the United States or the District is a party. By Executive order provision is made for court leave for certain Government employees who are absent from duty and in attendance in court as a witness in behalf of the United States or the Government of the District, or who are called for jury duty in any State court or court of the United States. Decisions of the Comptroller General have held that a Government employee required to appear in private litigation "may be regarded as in a duty and pay status during the period of his necessary absence . . . where the value of the witness testifying in private litigation arises from his official capacity and he is subpoenaed solely because of and to testify in that capacity or to produce official records."

It appears that existing legislation and precedents are not helpful in third-party negligent cases since they are brought in the name of the injured employee and so are private litigation in which the Government employees appearing as parties and witnesses are not testifying as to matters arising from any official capacity.

In such third-party cases, therefore, Government employees have been charged with annual leave or placed on leave without pay, while so engaged. This situation has caused great resentment in employees obligated to appear as parties and witnesses in such lawsuits. Since the Government requires the action to be prosecuted in the name of the injured employee, although it is in many cases the principal beneficiary of the action, employees obligated to appear should not be required to do so on their own time and at their own expense.

Section 206: This section would establish as the wage base for injured employees whose disability for work begins more than 1 year after they were injured, the monthly pay, at the time they were disabled, of the same job, position, or employment in which they were engaged when injured. Similarly, disabled employees who resume regular full-time employment and suffer a recurrence of the disability after more than 1 year, would have as their wage base the monthly pay, at the time of the recurrence of their disability, of the same job, position, or employment in which they were engaged when they were injured.

Section 207: This section would require all Federal agencies to include in their annual budget estimates a request for funds to repay the employees' compensation fund for the cost of benefits paid during the preceding fiscal year on account of the injury or death of employees under the jurisdiction of each such agency. The Secretary of Labor would be required to furnish to each executive department and each agency or instrumentality of the United States having employees who are or may be entitled to compensation benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act a statement showing the total cost of benefits and other payments made from the employees' compensation fund during the preceding fiscal year on account of the injury or death of employees or persons under the jurisdiction of the agency. The provision would make an additional charge against corporations and agencies subject to the Government Corporation Control Act for their fair share of the cost of administering the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

This provision would bring to the attention of the heads of each agency the cost of compensation for injuries to employees under his jurisdiction and require him to justify such expenditure to the Bureau of the Budget and to Congress.

Section 208: This section provides for the dates upon which various provisions of the bill would become effective and is, in most part, self-explanatory.

The bill does not retroactively grant any benefits for any past periods of disability nor are death benefits retroactively increased. All changes in benefit payments would be made prospectively. Where increased benefits are provided cases already on the rolls, the new benefit provisions would apply to old cases only with respect to any period beginning on or after the first date of the first calendar month following the enactment of this act.

An exception is the provision contained in section 201 of this act permitting the payment of compensation for scheduled permanent disability in addition to benefits under the Civil Service Act. This provision is applicable to any injury which occurred within 3 years prior to the date of enactment of this act as well as prospectively. Similarly, the provision in section 201 of this act requiring an election of the benefits in any case in which a claimant for compensation is also eligible to receive certain payments or benefits from the United States for the same disability or death is applicable to any injury or death occurring before enactment of this act as well as prospectively, but shall not deprive any person of benefits in any case in which an award has been made.

APPOINTMENT OF U.S. NATIONALS TO MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 216(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to permit the appointment of U.S. nationals to the Merchant Marine Academy. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3429) to amend section 216(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to permit the appointment of U.S. nationals to the Merchant Marine Academy, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read

twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., April 15, 1960.
HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed herewith is a draft of a proposed bill, "to amend section 216(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to permit the appointment of U.S. nationals to the Merchant Marine Academy."

We suggest that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

By the act of February 20, 1958 (Public Law 85-331; 46 U.S.C., sec. 1126(b)(1)), a quota for appointments to the Merchant Marine Academy from American Samoa was established. However, the Maritime Administration has construed the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to require appointees to the Merchant Marine Academy to be American citizens. Also, licensed officers of vessels documented under the laws of the United States are required to be American citizens.

The native population of American Samoa is composed almost entirely of persons who are nationals and who owe allegiance to the United States, but who are not citizens. Thus, it has been difficult to find qualified American Samoans who are eligible to accept appointment to the Merchant Marine Academy under Public Law 85-331.

The enclosed bill would serve merely to make training at the Academy available to those American Samoans who are now barred solely because of their status as nationals. Such appointees would, of course, have to meet the same standards of admission as are required of other cadets. The bill would preserve the existing bar against licensing of noncitizens as officers in the American Merchant Marine.

The sea is a vital element in the life of this island people. The schooling at the Academy of a few selected American Samoans would provide the territory with a small corps of professionally trained persons for local navigation, port administration, and the like.

There is precedent in existing law for the training of noncitizens (the act of August 9, 1946; 60 Stat. 961).

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER ERNST,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

CLARIFICATION OF RIGHT OF STATES TO SELECT CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the bill—S. 2959—to clarify the right of States to select certain public lands subject to any outstanding mineral lease or permit, which I introduced on February 2, of this year. This amendment has been worked out with the director of the Utah State Land Board in conference with the Department of the Interior.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received and printed, and will be appropriately referred.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT AND EXTENSION OF SUGAR ACT OF 1948—AMENDMENT

Mr. GOLDWATER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3210) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] be made a cosponsor of the bill—S. 3102—to establish an Office of International Travel.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADMISSIONS AND CONFESSIONS IN CRIMINAL PROCEEDING—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on Monday the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and I introduced a bill, S. 3411, to rescind the artificial rule of evidence established by the Supreme Court in the McNabb and Malloy cases, and to restore to the Federal law of evidence the sound rule of evidence that when an accused voluntarily confesses he committed a crime his voluntary confession shall be admissible against him when he is tried for such crime.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] be designated upon the RECORD as cosponsors of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the bill—S. 3310—to amend the act entitled "An act to transfer the maintenance and operation of hospital and health facilities for Indians to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1954, has been referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This measure has to do with problems involving medical care for our American Indians provided by the U.S. Public Health Service.

Inasmuch as the responsibility for providing health services to Indians has been transferred from the Department of the Interior to the Public Health Service, and since legislation affecting that agency is within the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 3310, and that it be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JACKSON] are the cosponsors of the bill. Their offices advise me they have no objection to the referral of the proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 27, 1960, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1751) to place in trust status certain lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Speech by Hon. JOHN M. SLACK, JR., a Representative from West Virginia, and excerpts from other speeches delivered at first anniversary dinner of the mayor's commission on human relations, Charleston, W. Va., April 26, 1960.

By Mr. JACKSON:

Remarks by Senator RANDOLPH delivered at a dinner meeting of the mayor's commission on human relations, Charleston, W. Va., April 26, 1960.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

Press release by Senator HENNINGS entitled "The Needs of the Elderly," dated February 24, 1960; editorial comment on press release published in the Charleston Enterprise-Courier of Charleston, Mo., under date of February 25, 1960; reply to editorial by Senator HENNINGS under date of March 17, 1960; and letter by the editor of the Charleston Enterprise-Courier in reply to letter of Senator HENNINGS.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

Testimony given by Representative FORAND before the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

Article entitled "The Student Loyalty Oath," written by Senator McCARTHY, published in the Commonwealth of April 22, 1960.

INVEST-IN-AMERICA WEEK—THE NATION'S SIXTH ANNUAL CELEBRATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the days and years ahead of us, our Nation faces a challenge, as never before, to its top-ranking position as the greatest productive country in the world. According to recent statistics, industrial growth in our most formidable competitor, the Soviet Union, is increasing at the approximate rate of from 9 to 10 percent per year, while that in the United States amounts to only about 4½ percent. And, although a recent economic analysis reports that our gross national product is over twice that of the U.S.S.R., Communist leaders have claimed that by 1965 the Socialist camp will produce over one-half of the total world industrial output. In addition, although I believe this to be greatly exaggerated, they have promised their

people that by 1970 they will have the world's highest standard of living. Today, our free enterprise system, together with our political institutions, philosophy, indeed, our very way of life, is in a battle for survival with communism.

However, we feel confident that our American system of free enterprise will emerge triumphant in this battle of ideologies. In a more optimistic spirit of retrospect, we look back over the past decade and discover that the year 1959 marks the end of an era of remarkable economic progress in many free lands, and one in which America's form of democratic capitalism has played an increasingly important, worldwide role. For example, in the field of corporate investment, individual shareowners in publicly owned companies, since 1952, have increased by 6 million, to 12½ million, as of early last year. In the 1950's, share volume was greater than in any previous decade. Significantly, these shareowners in America's future represent a broad cross section of the public; and, during 1959 alone, they have received over \$464 million in distributed income dividends.

Mr. President, we recognize that the voluntary accumulation of savings and the investment of those savings either by individuals or through financial institutions, form the heart of our free enterprise system. We know that it is only through savings that the growth and development of our economy can take place. And we know, too, that it is the increasing investment of these savings which makes us more productive, provides more jobs and paychecks, and raises the standard of living for all of our people. Whether we own a business or work in an office, a factory, in agriculture, or in a profession, investments, of one form or another, make possible our work, our homes, and the industries and utilities which serve us.

The current week—April 24 through 30—is being observed all over the United States as the sixth annual Invest-in-America Week. Celebrated this year in over 200 communities throughout the country, Invest-in-America Week is being supported on local and national levels by newspapers, trade and financial publications, radio, and television. Emphasizing the importance of thrift and savings to our Nation's continuing growth, its purposes and objectives are admirably summed up in the statement of belief, as prepared by the National Invest-in-America Committee, Inc., the parent group and headquarters, located in Philadelphia:

We believe as a basic principle that the American competitive enterprise system, which has provided all our people with the highest standards of living in the world, is based on continuing investment of savings in all forms.

We believe that investment of savings can provide: For the people—personal security and increased income for education, retirement and better living; for industry—plants, tools and jobs to provide better products for more people; and for Government—the means of production to keep America strong.

We believe that only through broad public understanding of those facts, as well as of factors that hamper or discourage savings, can the United States achieve these broad national economic goals: (1) Full employment

of its labor force; (2) vigorous but sustainable economic growth, accompanied by monetary stability; (3) stability of the general price level; (4) preservation of economic and political freedom.

We believe that these goals are vitally interdependent and must be pursued as a whole, if 56 million American families and their children are to be able to enjoy continued economic security, opportunities for better living and economic, religious and political freedom.

We believe that when the American people know and understand, as a result of educational efforts, the underlying factors that make possible vigorous economic growth and full employment opportunities for all who wish to work, they will be able to recognize financial and economic trends that are not to their best interest, thus enabling them to discharge their responsibilities as American citizens.

I have been particularly gratified that my own State of Wisconsin has been very active in past years' observances, and I have been pleased to learn that this year eight of our largest communities will take part—Milwaukee, Madison, Oshkosh, Janesville, Stevens Point, Fond du Lac, Sheboygan, and Grantsburg. Headed by Mr. Roth S. Schleck, the very able Wisconsin State chairman of Invest-in-America, and the vice president of the First Wisconsin National Bank in Milwaukee, some of the State's most distinguished individuals are helping to bring the Invest-in-America message to the public. Mr. Schleck reports in a recent letter that—

The importance of the Invest-in-America effort daily is gaining greater recognition and enthusiastic support in Wisconsin. We expect this year's observance of Invest-in-America Week to be the most extensive to date and that it will provide a springboard for year-round activities in various parts of the State.

In another letter, Mr. Schleck kindly informs me of the activities of the State committee, and lists the individuals who are heading the observance in Wisconsin communities.

The outstanding activities of Invest-in-America have been recognized in past years' observances by the President of the United States, in congratulatory messages to the national and local Invest-in-America Committees. This year, President Eisenhower, in a telegram to the distinguished chairman of 1960 Invest-in-America Week, Mr. Gardiner Symonds, stated:

It is a pleasure to join in the observance of National Invest-in-America Week. For the healthy economic growth of our Nation we put major reliance upon the thrift, foresight, and sound investment of individual citizens engaged in private enterprise. In the years ahead, a growing America will require even greater savings and investment by our people to provide needed capital, tools, jobs and defensive strength. We must use our present resources to insure our children's future through investment in homes, insurance and sound securities. Investment in America is an investment in the world's best hope for freedom, justice and broad economic progress.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

For the past several years, it has been my pleasure to be host at receptions and kickoff luncheons here at the Capitol—celebrating observances of Invest-in-America Week and honoring officers and

members of the national and Metropolitan Washington area invest-in-America committees. At last year's luncheon in the Old Supreme Court Chamber, here at the Capitol, many of my colleagues in the Senate and House of Representatives were present, as well as leaders of the executive agencies of the Government, and local business and civic leaders. Initiating the fifth annual observance of national invest-in-American activities, its purpose was to dramatize the principles of this constructive program and to stimulate interest in year-round activities. Publicly joining in its endorsement were Mr. Norman Mason, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency; Mr. Wendell Barnes, Administrator of the Small Business Administration; and Mr. Andrew D. Orrick, Senior Commissioner of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Mr. President, the invest-in-America program has ably demonstrated that it is a solid-growth enterprise. In slightly more than a decade, the organization—which originally was inspired by an editorial in the Investment Dealers' Digest, in 1949—has taken root, and has grown steadily to the point where over 200 communities in our United States, including the latest addition to our family of States—Hawaii, now participate in these activities. Recognizing that the encouragement of more people to invest their incomes and savings in American enterprise is fundamental to our economic progress, and believing that there is a need for even greater public awareness of this important fact, during the last session I introduced in the Senate a joint resolution which would authorize and request the President of the United States to proclaim the current week of April 24 through 30, 1960, as National Invest-in-America Week throughout the United States of America. As stated in a subsequent letter directed to my colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], I believe that by the proclamation and observance of a National Invest-in-America Week, such as I have proposed, Americans can reaffirm their belief in the power of work, savings, and investments to create new business and better job opportunities for all our citizens.

Unfortunately, due to several unavoidable circumstances, including the extensive consideration of civil right matters, the subcommittee was unable to report Senate Joint Resolution 143 in sufficient time for this year's observance. However, I intend to reintroduce this meritorious measure during the next session of the Congress; and it is my sincere wish that my colleagues will join with me in obtaining its enactment. It requests the President to call upon Americans to observe such a week in recognition of the great endeavor in which the American people are now engaged to preserve their economic, religious, and political freedoms on the bloodless economic battlefield of competition in a free enterprise society.

I send to the desk several items. The first is a fine statement entitled "What Invest-in-America Means," prepared by the New York City Invest-in-America Committee. The second is an excellent report by Dr. J. Whitney Bunting, consultant for the higher educational relations of the General Electric Co., and governor of the National Invest-in-America Committee. The article is entitled "Your Share in America's Prosperity"; and it tells how our national strength is closely tied to the progress of business, industry, and government; and that they, in turn, are dependent upon the savings of our citizens. The third item is the previously mentioned, very fine letter from the Wisconsin State chairman of invest-in-America, Mr. Roth S. Schleck. His letter describes the preparations for this year's observance. I ask unanimous consent that these items be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement, report, and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT INVEST-IN-AMERICA MEANS

(A statement by the New York City Invest-in-America Committee)

Savings and investments are essential to a strong America because they provide—

Job security and higher standards of living for 56 million families.

Capital for the plants and tools necessary for an expanding economy.

Strength for a free government.

In the years ahead America will have to provide—

Seventeen billion dollars a year for a million new jobs a year. This is \$17,000 in new capital investment for each job.

Forty billion dollars a year to maintain plants and machines to sustain the 70 million present jobs.

Where will this money come from?

From the collective savings and investments of millions of Americans.

From the retained earnings of corporations.

Therefore, every American owes it to himself to become an investor in America through savings of his own choice in Government securities, savings accounts, insurance, homes, and corporate stocks and bonds.

The strength of a growing America is in the personal freedom to work, save, and invest. Money at work means men at work.

Invest-in-America for security and income. Money at work means men at work.

YOUR SHARE IN AMERICA'S PROSPERITY

YOU AND OUR NATION'S BUSINESS

Many people in this country fail to recognize their stake in the welfare and development of American business. In fact, there are many of our friends who may not recognize that they are really owners of capital and various types of business enterprise. Because this is true, this small booklet is designed to show you that you not only are a capitalist but that your interest and action is needed to keep our system strong.

The competitive enterprise system has strong roots in the United States. It has enabled this Nation to achieve a standard of living not equalled under any other economic order in the world today. However, like others it must be constantly nourished through the active participation of those who receive its benefits. Whether you are a person of great wealth or an income earner in modest circumstances, your interest is necessary. You will see, as you read this message, that many of our most active citizens are those with annual incomes of less

than \$7,500. Let us examine your position in the business world and what it means to you.

OUR BUSINESS SYSTEM

Our business system often described as a "competitive enterprise" system. This means that the basic regulating force of our economic life is the needs and desires of the individual citizen unless they conflict in some way with the interest of the general public. Competitive enterprise has many real advantages to the people of America for it assures us of the right to obtain and hold property, live wherever we please, buy and sell what we choose, select our own means of earning a living, and many others.

Our only limitations under competitive enterprise are when our actions are against public policy (such as failure to respect the rights of others) and our own personal shortcomings that may limit our ability to perform certain tasks as well as other people. Moreover, through ingenuity and hard work, it is possible to rise from one social level to another—our history is filled with true stories of such progress. The important thing to remember is that although we are free to progress, we cannot advance without personal effort or enterprise.

Through competitive enterprise, the American worker lives better at less cost in labor than the citizens of all other nations. We often measure the costs of different products that we buy, not in terms of money, but in terms of work hours. In this way, we can compare the actual cost of buying a suit of clothes or a loaf of bread. It can be proved that a man's suit of clothes requires 24 hours of work to an average American workman, while the Russian worker must work for 376 hours to get enough income to buy the same product. In America it requires approximately half as much work time to earn a loaf of bread as it does in Russia. And so it goes for every product or service we need or use.

With only 7 percent of the world's population, Americans have 33 percent of the world's assets. In this respect, we can claim 53 percent of world's radios and television sets, 29 percent of world's railway mileage, 50 percent of world's highways, 57.5 percent of world's telephones, and 70 percent of world's automobiles.

Much of our success in production can be traced to our use of fine tools and efficient machines. These, of course, can only be acquired through the savings and investments of all Americans.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN—PATRON OF SOUND SAVINGS

"A penny saved is a penny earned" is one of the best known statements of Benjamin Franklin, but even Franklin knew there was more to financial success than mere saving. He pursued a personal program of investing in business and country that made him an outstanding example for Americans of today. For example, another of his famous statements that is truly a valuable guidepost for all Americans today was "money begets money and its offspring begets more." The principle that money clearly can go to work for its owner was definitely established.

A practical example of what Benjamin Franklin meant when he said that "money begets money * * *" is well illustrated by one of his personal actions. Always proud of his early years spent in Boston, he left the sum of \$5,000 to the city in 1791 with instructions that it be allowed to accumulate at interest for 100 years. His directions were followed and in 1891, 100 years later, the fund had grown to approximately \$400,000. The idea was so sound that of this amount, \$300,000 was reinvested in a second century fund, and today, only 69 years later, the fund is in excess of \$1 million. This is real financial growth demonstrated in practical fashion.

Benjamin Franklin was neither the first nor the only great historical figure that believed in the value of saving and investing. From important men of early recorded history to the men and women of today, the successful have practiced both thrift and wise investment. Abraham Lincoln expressed his beliefs in this fashion: "The prudent, penniless beginner in the world labors for wages awhile, saves a surplus with which to buy land or tools for himself, and at length hires another new beginner to help him. This is the just and generous and prosperous system which opens the way to all—gives hope to all and consequent energy and progress and improvement of conditions to all."

And, in more recent days, Ralph J. Cordiner, chairman of the board of the General Electric Co., as he addressed the 1958 annual stockholders meeting said in part: "In a free economy, economic growth is paced and directed by the decisions of millions of businessmen, consumers, investors, employees—indeed by every citizen. The faith of the free society is that these millions of points of initiative will produce swifter progress, with greater liberty, than any system of centralized control."

"Thus, a business recession is really a test of the people of the United States and their form of society. Their decisions—to buy, to invest, to work more purposefully, to raise their levels of living—these decisions will determine the speed of economic advance. They will also decide whether Russia will, as she has announced, surpass us in the coming years."

WHAT ABOUT THIS WORD "CAPITALIST"?

Some people in other lands would have you believe that there is something wrong in being a capitalist. The Russians would say that capitalism is a bad system of doing business. However, this is untrue because all economic systems use capital. Capital in reality refers to the tools and machines that men use in production. In Russia, as in the United States, capital is used in large quantities in industrial production.

The main difference between the two ideas is who owns the capital? In Russia, all capital is owned by the Government and can legally be used only to produce those goods that the Government desires. In the United States, on the other hand, capital is owned by millions of free investors who can put this capital to work producing those goods that the public needs and wants. The desires of the people are expressed by their willingness to buy the finished goods at a fair price at the marketplace.

In America, almost everyone is a capitalist because he shares in the ownership of business and industry.

PEOPLE'S CAPITALISM

In order to better describe the economic system under which we live, the phrase "people's capitalism" has been developed. You will see it more and more in the newspapers, in advertising and as part of daily conversation. It denotes merely the type of capitalism that this Nation has found to be most successful for all concerned. This is a system where all citizens have a right and privilege to own a share in business and industry.

HOW YOU BECOME A CAPITALIST

In a competitive economic society such as ours, a person receives value or money for what he produces. A definite contribution of effort, or money, or time, or material must be made in order to receive a reward from society. When a man does not spend all of the money or income he has received for his services, he is said to have saved. In our society he has the right to hold this saving in any manner he desires or he can put it to work through investment. If he invests a wide variety of ways, or if he should use normal banking facilities for safekeeping, he

becomes a capitalist, for by investing in something he owns something.

MONEY AT WORK MEANS MEN AT WORK

It is not a well-known fact that a heavy investment of capital is required in order to make a job. There are few employment opportunities in business and industry today where the employee can provide his own tools and equipment. As industry becomes larger and more complex, the problem of job-making becomes more costly and more difficult. Someone must invest so that industry can afford to employ the worker. Thus, when a saver invests his excess funds in a business, that money can be used to employ additional workers and make more jobs.

The chart adjoining shows the average need for capital funds for one worker in different industries in 1956. Costs today would be substantially higher because of the greater complexity of 1959 production. Unless the American people are willing to put their money to work, there will be insufficient job opportunities for the Nation's expanding population. It will then be difficult to have as many products and services to enjoy as are now available.

WHAT IS INVESTING?

Investing refers to putting your money to work. If you buy stock in a corporation, place your savings in a bank, take out life insurance, or buy real estate, your money is productive because it is used by business, industry, or Government to develop production of products or services.

INVESTMENT OPPORTUNITIES

There are many opportunities for safe and sound investments, and it is not necessary to have a great amount of money to begin. For example, the following opportunities for investment are available to you in the small amounts listed.

Savings account, \$5 or less.

Postal savings, any amount.

U.S. savings bonds, \$18.75.

Real estate, varying amounts.

Savings and loan associations, any amount.

Life insurance, any amount.

Stocks, \$40 quarterly (through New York Stock Exchange program).

So, it is a question of the amount of money you have to invest as it is of the regularity with which you do it.

The ownership of corporate stock, for example, is no longer the privilege of the few. Men, women, and children, from every walk of life and from every section of the country, share ownership of the Nation's companies. More than 12,500,000 persons are stockholders in public corporations. An additional 1,500,000 own shares in private corporations. Each year, over 500,000 new persons become stockholders.

There are more women stockholders in publicly held companies than there are men, according to the New York Stock Exchange. Women shareowners make up 51.6 percent of the total in America. Moreover, there is a growing concentration of stockholders whose annual incomes are less than \$7,500. This indicates that many people believe that stocks are one key to a successful life.

CAN YOU SAVE AND NOT INVEST?

It is certainly possible to save and not invest, and some people follow this procedure. A reliable estimate shows that about \$10 billion is in the hands of "hoarders," that is, those persons who hold their money in safe deposit boxes or in their homes. This is not a good practice for several basic reasons. First, money wisely invested will bring in a return, such as interest or dividends, and thus will continually increase in amount. Money hoarded earns nothing, so in the end you have no more than you started with.

Second, in periods of inflationary conditions where prices of goods rise and the value of money declines, your hoarded money

has increasingly less value than it had when you earned it. Investment in securities such as corporate stocks tends to increase in value along with general prices. The purchasing power of your savings so invested should increase because under these conditions the value of this type of investment rises too.

Third, and even more important to your country, industry and government need to use all available funds for progress and growth. When you hoard, you are contributing nothing to your Nation's well-being, upon which your own prosperity entirely depends.

HOW MAY YOU INVEST?

You probably have many forms and types of investment already in existence although you may not realize it. The breadth of investment opportunity is measured largely in terms of the manner in which we save and put our money to work. A brief review of the extent of these savings, which increased an estimated \$23.3 billion in 1959, will show their importance.

Savings banks and time deposits in commercial banks

As of last yearend Americans had \$34.9 billion deposited in mutual savings banks. This figure has more than tripled since before World War II. In addition, savers have put \$65.4 billion in time deposits in commercial banks. This figure too has shown remarkable growth during the past 15-year period. Such deposits before World War II amounted to only \$16 billion.

The money deposited in these accounts is invested in business and industry by the banks, and thus creates capital for more and better production. As an indirect partner in the investment process, you are an investor.

Savings and loan associations

This form of saving mechanism is relatively new in our economy although it is an outgrowth of the building and loan association. An indication of its value lies in the fact that savings in these institutions have increased 12 times since before World War II. From an approximate figure of \$4.3 billion in 1940, savings and loan associations now hold \$54.6 billion of savings.

The accent on investment in these institutions is home ownership, but they also have widespread interests in business and other pursuits.

Government savings opportunities

An excellent opportunity to save and to make your money work for you is found in U.S. savings bonds. Americans have invested currently around \$48.2 billion in these bonds. During the war, and postwar years, such investments approached \$60 billion, but the end of hostilities removed some of the emotional urge associated with savings bonds. They still continue to attract many investors, however.

The outstanding obligations of State and local government units total about \$60 billion, 25 percent of which is now held by commercial banks. Such bonds are especially attractive to large investors, because they are free of Federal income taxes.

Insurance

Dollarwise, one of the most important savings and investment opportunities is found in the policy reserves of insurance companies including life, casualty, and fire. There are over 109 million life insurance policyholders alone in America today, and the combined assets of life insurance companies amount to approximately \$113.6 billion. This great mass of savings is channeled into a wide variety of business, industrial, and personal activities and constitutes a tremendous economic resource.

The average policyholder does not consider himself a "capitalist" when he pays his

insurance premium, but a large share of that premium is invested for safety and growth in American industry. Thus, as a capital owner, he becomes a capitalist.

Corporate stocks and bonds

Security investments are, of course, direct investments in business and industry. A share of stock represents a part ownership in the issuing corporation; a bond represents a loan to a corporation or governmental body—Federal, State, or local. In each case, the investor is in direct contact with the user of his savings.

As of the last yearend, the market value of stocks on the New York Stock Exchange approximated \$300 billion; on the American Stock Exchange \$26.5 billion. Many of these same issues as well as their own primary listings may be purchased and sold by the investing public on regional exchanges. Most commercial bank and insurance company stocks are traded over the counter, where active markets in government and corporate bonds are also maintained.

Investment trusts and pension funds

Two of the most rapidly growing depositories for the small investor's savings are investment trusts and pension funds. As of the yearend the assets of mutual funds and closed-end trusts exceeded \$17 billion. The assets of pension funds, growing at the rate of over \$4 billion annually, were in excess of \$33 billion. These savings are largely invested in stocks and bonds.

KNOW WHY YOU INVEST

When you plan to invest your savings and put your money to work, it is important that you know why you are investing. There are many good reasons for investing, but the following purposes should be considered in light of your personal circumstances.

Safety: Every investor believes that the investment he chooses is safe. That is one reason for putting savings into someone else's hands so that they may protect it. However, interest and dividends paid for the use of this money tend to indicate that there is some risk connected with investing. High dividend payments may reflect either a strong company that is earning well, or it may indicate a very weak company that is a poor risk.

Growth: Many investors, particularly the young, invest with the thought that their money values will grow over the years. With steady incomes now they can invest regularly in the hope that when the funds are needed, they will have increased in amount. So-called growth stocks often do not pay high dividends, but they are purchased in the hope that they will grow in value with the economy.

Income: Many investors, frequently those in the later years of their lives, prefer securities in quality industries with dividend payments higher than are made by the so-called growth enterprises. Subject to the cautions mentioned previously, it is possible to invest for good income purposes.

There are investments that can appeal to any person or purpose, and planned investing makes your money work for you and for the country's welfare.

DON'T GO IT ALONE

Investing is for everyone who is interested in his future yet it should not be done blindly. There are many avenues of indirect investment for the person who has no knowledge of the stock market or individual securities. By placing your money in savings banks, or savings and loan associations, or by purchasing life insurance, or by buying mutual funds, you get the advantages of good management of your money. Thus, you cut down on the dangers and risks of unwise investment.

If you enter the stock market, however, be sure to get the services of a reliable broker or investment banker. Get his ad-

vice and follow it. If you are investing in real estate be sure to deal only with reputable realtors. The greatest risk in investing is to buy blindly without proper knowledge or advice regarding the particular type of investment you are making. Investment plans and programs can be set up by experts to meet almost any purpose.

IN SUMMARY

The story we have tried to tell is that our national strength is closely tied to the progress of business, industry, and government, and they in turn are dependent on your savings. The American competitive enterprise system has been compared to a four-legged stool with the legs signifying management, labor, capital, and the consumer. Without even one of the legs, business would collapse. It is as simple as that.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower in citing the importance of National Invest-in-America Week in 1957, said: "As our people freely invest their savings in productive enterprise, our economy is strengthened through research and construction of new plant and equipment, through new jobs and raised living standards. Each bank account, each insurance policy, each bond or share of stock contributes capital to advance the security of the Nation and of each citizen."

Your share in America's prosperity is what you make it through regular savings and investment in America.

THE NATIONAL INVEST-IN-AMERICA COMMITTEE,

April 7, 1960.

SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Now that most of the contacts I planned to make before the 1960 Invest-in-America Week observance have been made, I would like to take this opportunity to inform you of the activities of the State committee here in Wisconsin.

At our last meeting it was decided that more extensive and varied representation should be sought and, as a result of presenting the principles of the organization to various people, we have, fortunately, been able to add the names of several new members to our list, namely:

Rev. Bernard W. Dempsey, head of the economics department in the College of Business Administration of Marquette University.

Harold F. Dickens, State director of the U.S. Treasury Department, Savings Bonds Division.

Allen Pfugrad, executive vice president of First Federal Savings and Loan Association.

We are in the process of contacting several public relations people who would be of considerable value to the committee, especially in the methods used in bringing the I-in-A message to the public.

On the local scene, here and in the various communities of Wisconsin, I have appointed the following chairmen:

Milwaukee: A. W. Drigot, treasurer, Basic Products Corp.

Janesville: Earl Best, secretary-treasurer, the Parker Pen Co. in Janesville, representing the Wisconsin Manufacturers Association.

Madison: J. C. Howdle, vice president and treasurer, National Guardian Life Insurance Co. in Madison.

Stevens Point: Robert Sueck, treasurer, Hardware Mutuals.

Fond du Lac: Andre J. Perry, president, First National Bank of Fond du Lac, representing the State chamber of commerce.

Also carrying out programs in their cities will be (we hope to add Eau Claire):

Grantsburg: Walter Jensen, president, First Bank of Grantsburg.

Sheboygan: John C. De Master, vice president, Citizens Bank of Sheboygan.

Oshkosh: Carl A. Biederman, president, Oshkosh National Bank.

The local members, most of whom were introduced to the I-in-A purpose rather late last year, will be able to conduct a little more expansive and concentrated effort this year with newspaper publicity, radio and TV spot announcements, and various posters and exhibits shown in a number of business and public places. With a new national chairman who, as you may no doubt know, is Gardiner Symonds of the Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., and new committees formed to review past performance, principles, and effects achieved and to enlarge the program into a year-round effort, I believe this year's observance will be one which will stimulate a great deal of interest and will increase in its scope in the future. We hope to accomplish this in 1960 and in the years to come.

I was pleased to read in the March 24 issue of your newsletter that you have again, as in the past, introduced a resolution in Congress which would authorize and request a Presidential proclamation of I-in-A-Week, April 24 through April 30. I wholeheartedly agree with your statement therein, that "America's form of democratic capitalism has played an increasingly important worldwide role." I assure you that we, on the Wisconsin committee, will do all we can to promote the I-in-A message as effectively as we can, and consider ourselves fortunate in having your assistance in the key position that you hold. With the decision, too, to make the effort a year-round activity, plans which will incorporate the I-in-A message whenever opportunities arise throughout the year, will intensify the effects we are trying to achieve—that of reaching more people, more often, until Invest-in-America becomes a slogan familiar to everyone as an integral part of their daily lives.

With kind regards, and much appreciation for your continued support, I am,
Sincerely yours,

ROTH S. SCHLECK,
Chairman, I-in-A Wisconsin Committee.

"WELL, WHAT ABOUT YOU?"—A TV PROGRAM ON VOTING

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the 1960 presidential election year, the major challenges confronting the Nation include: First, crystallizing the national issues in the campaign; second, determining the capabilities of candidates for providing the Nation with leadership to meet these challenges, and third, getting out the vote, to assure maximum participation by citizens in our electoral process.

In a republic, each of us has a great responsibility.

As citizens, we face the task of making these evaluations, and then registering our conclusions at the ballot box.

Over the years, regrettably, there has been a deplorable absenteeism at the polls. This gross neglect of citizen duty has ranged from 24 percent, in 1904—the lowest ebb in history—to 63 percent in 1952. Even the high of 63 percent, we all recognize, is still far too low.

We realize, of course, that there are differing opinions as to just how to get greater voter participation in elections. The real challenge is educating the public on the need to become informed on the issues and candidates, and then on the value of exercising their voice at the ballot box—a right and privilege upon which the Republic was established.

Fortunately, there is becoming an ever wider awareness of the dangers of the widespread negligence about voting.

We realize, however, that awareness is not enough. Instead, constructive efforts must be undertaken to educate eligible voters in all walks of life on the significance of a voter's role in the Republic; the necessity of becoming familiar with the issues and the qualifications of candidates; the voting fundamentals, such as registration for primaries and general elections, ballot marking, operating voting machines, and other fundamentals of voting.

Symbolic of efforts to stimulate greater voter activity, the Ford Motor Co. recently sponsored a splendid television show, by Dore Schary, entitled, "Well, What About You?"

On the program, outstanding Americans, including Vice President NIXON, and other leaders in the political, cultural, legal, and other fields, expressed their views on the need for greater voter participation in elections.

The program conveyed inspirational and creative ideas on the need for getting out the vote. I ask unanimous consent that selected excerpts from the program be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"WELL, WHAT ABOUT YOU?"

EDDIE ALBERT. Ladies and gentlemen, you, the citizens of the United States, elect to public office in your Nation or your State or your city, almost 800,000 officials. No, that's not a typographical error—800,000. In 1960, at national election time there will be 180 million people living in the United States. This means that one out of every 225 American citizens is elected to some kind of public office. This program tonight, presented by the Ford Motor Car Co., asks you frankly and simply to take your franchise seriously, to examine and to use your vote.

It is proper that the first appeal be made to you by the Vice President of the United States, RICHARD M. NIXON.

Vice President NIXON. There has probably never been an American who was not articulate concerning the obligations of citizens. One of these great statesmen expressed himself eloquently on the subject. He was Theodore Roosevelt. And this is something of what he had to say: "The first requisite of good citizenship is that the man shall do the homely, everyday, humdrum duties well. A man is not a good citizen, I do not care how lofty his thoughts are about citizenship in the abstract, if in the concrete, his actions do not bear them out; and it does not make much difference how high his aspirations for mankind at large may be, if he does not behave well in his own family, those aspirations do not bear visible fruit. He must be a good breadwinner, he must take care of his wife and his children, he must be a neighbor whom his neighbors can trust, he must act squarely in his business relations—he must do all these everyday, ordinary duties first, or he is not a good citizen. But he must do more. In this country of ours the average citizen must devote a good deal of thought and time to the affairs of the state as a whole or those affairs will go backward; and he must devote that thought and that time steadily and intelligently."

And to Theodore Roosevelt, I can only add that when the average citizen has devoted a good deal of thought and time to the affairs of the state, he must then vote in terms of basic principles and objectives. I know

that's what you plan to do and I urge you to do that on election day.

EDDIE. I mentioned before the fact that at election time this year, there will be 180 million residents of the United States and it is estimated that the amount of eligible voters will be 100 million. Mr. Joseph Welch has something to say about that.

WELCH. Well, as you see, we have here the symbols of the legendary country store; the cracker barrel, the pot-bellied stove, and the cane-backed rocker. We are told that in the olden days, our citizenry kept informed and discussed the issues and the candidates on a high level with native shrewdness and wisdom.

Well, like so many things we hear about the past, it makes nice telling. But it just ain't so.

Here are some interesting statistics about votes in presidential years. The facts are, we're doing better than we did years ago, but more than one out of three of every American voters is abdicating one of the most precious rights he has. Take a look. In 1900, only 29 percent of the voting population went to the polls. In 1904, when we reached probably the lowest point in national apathy, a little less than 24 percent exercised their rights. And as you see, the three following campaigns still remained under 30 percent. In 1920, better communication, perhaps stronger issues began to arouse the public and the percentages went up in successive campaigns from 41 percent and in 1932 up to 51 percent, and as you see, the highest percentage was in 1952 when slightly less than 63 percent of the voters declared for the men of their choice. But here in 1956 you see, there was a slight dip. They tell the story of the president of a small railroad who was visiting in New York and went to see President Dewey who was head of the largest railroad in the world. Mr. Dewey asked, "What can I do for you?" and the visiting head of the little railroad explained he was in to arrange for an exchange of courtesies. He would give Mr. Dewey a pass if Mr. Dewey would give him a pass over his road. Well, President Dewey thought about that for a moment and then said, "Well, where's your railroad?" The visitor said, "Wisconsin." Dewey then said, "I never heard of your railroad. How long is it?" The visitor answered proudly, "76 miles." President Dewey took a deep breath of irritation and said, "76 miles—you call that an exchange of courtesies—why, my railroad has tens of thousands of miles." Calmly the visitor looked at Mr. Dewey and said quietly, "Well, sir, your road may be a little longer, than mine, but it ain't any wider."

So please do remember that. You may live in a small town or a large city but nowhere, anywhere, is anyone's vote wider than yours. Neither is it any longer.

EDDIE ALBERT. We are privileged to hear now from the former Governor of Illinois, Adlai E. Stevenson.

Governor STEVENSON. On November 3, 1846, a great American writer, Walt Whitman, wrote an editorial for the Brooklyn Eagle. What he had to say then is still pertinent today and I am privileged to read it to you:

"Few people estimate the value and importance of a single vote." One vote sent Oliver Cromwell to the Long Parliament. Little thought the holder of that vote that his hand was to send Charles Stuart to the scaffold, and to convulse an empire with revolution. One vote elected Marcus Morton Governor of Massachusetts in 1841, out of an aggregate of 100,000. One vote filled the vacancies of the State senate in 1843, and again secured the election of Marcus Morton as Governor.

Four votes given to the fifth ward of the city of New York, made Thomas Jefferson President of the United States.

One vote repealed the tariff of 1842. Who can say that one vote can make no difference, and this his own is not the will whose expression shall finally turn the chance of the lot? One vote, like a drop of water, may be insignificant of itself and alone, but combined with myriads of others, may determine the destiny of a nation.

"Divide the thunder into single tones," says Schiller, "and it becomes a lullaby for children; but pour it forth in one quick peal and the royal sound shall shake the heavens."

Therefore, ladies and gentlemen, in the coming election, I urge you to "shake the heavens."

EDDIE ALBERT. Now, you are to hear from the Governor of the State of New York, Nelson Rockefeller.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. Two years ago, when I announced that I was going to run in the primaries for the Governor of the State of New York, people called me up and said, "Why are you going to get into politics? Politics is a dirty business."

Can you imagine in this country today people feeling that politics is a dirty business, when politics is the very lifeblood of democracy—the very essence of our way of life?

And if politics is a dirty business, then you had better get into politics and clean it up and see that we have the kind of political structure that you and I want. But politics is not a dirty business. It is your business and it is my business.

Too few people, I think, realize that free government, democratic government cannot rise higher than the vitality and integrity of our political parties. And, therefore, the caliber of men and women who are in those parties, the issues which are before those parties, the candidates who are running in the primaries, are your business, and it is tremendously important that you vote in the primaries for your party's candidates and your selection.

And it is equally important, if we want to meet the challenge that democracy is faced with today, the challenge of free men, if we want to preserve the forces of freedom at home and equal opportunity for all, it is up to you to vote in the elections, to understand the issues, to know which candidate in the various levels of government you feel can represent those forces which are our heritage.

So vote in the primaries and vote in the elections.

Thank you.

EDDIE ALBERT. We will now hear from the heads of the two major political parties in the United States. Mr. Paul Butler, chairman of the Democratic Party, and Senator THURSTON MORTON, chairman of the Republican Party. First, Mr. Butler.

PAUL BUTLER. I, too, am a great admirer of Theodore Roosevelt. And on the obligation of citizens to vote he had this to say: "It is not only your right to vote, but it is your duty—if you are indeed free men and American citizens. I want to see every man vote. I would rather have you come to the polls even if you voted against me than have you shirk your duty." And, later, speaking at the Harvard Union in 1907, Mr. Roosevelt said: "To take part in the work of government does not in the least mean of necessity to hold office. It means to take an intelligent, disinterested, and practical part in the everyday duties of the average citizen, of the citizen who is not a faddist or a doctrinaire, but who abhors corruption and dislikes inefficiency; who wishes to see decent government prevail at home, with genuine equality of opportunity for all men so far as it can be brought about; and who wishes, as far as foreign matters are concerned, to see this Nation treat all other nations, great and small, with respect, and if need be with generosity, and at the same time show herself able to pro-

tect herself by her own might from any wrong at the hands of any outside power." For Theodore Roosevelt believed that, "Unless democracy is based on the principle of service by everybody who claims the enjoyment of any right, it is not true democracy at all."

And because all of us know that true democracy is the great shining light of the future, I hope that next election day nothing will come between you and your vote.

EDDIE ALBERT. Now, Senator MORTON.
Senator MORTON. The publication American Druggist, in 1950, published these words of former President Herbert Hoover: "Successful representative government depends on the existence of two major political parties: One to carry the responsibility of government administration, the other to provide the fundamental checks and balances by opposing and ventilating the administrative actions. The two-party system also provides an anvil of debate in legislative halls where the merits and demerits of proposals can be hammered out." Benjamin Franklin once remarked: "By the collision of different sentiments, sparks of truth fly out and political light is obtained." When a debate is over and some conclusions reached by a majority on a public question, either in the legislative halls or at the ballot box, the Constitution still stands there with its checks and balances to protect the minority. We have no arbitrary government by the majority. And over all government and politics, there is a balance of power greater than all this machinery of procedures, whether elections, debates, or laws. That is, just plain morals. So a citizen has a complex duty. He ought to learn to express opinions and to make up his own mind pro and con on the principal public issues. He ought never to miss the ballot box. And when he casts his vote for somebody, he should weigh that somebody on scales or morals—which includes intellectual integrity."

EDDIE ALBERT. In voting, it is certainly vital that we know what a candidate stands for and against. And with the broad avenues of communication now available to us by newspaper, magazines, radio, and television, we are able to get accurate and full pictures of our future political campaigns and campaigners and make up our own minds on the evidence. * * *

Our next distinguished guest is a U.S. Senator from Massachusetts, JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Senator KENNEDY. Certainly one of our great humorists was Mark Twain, and he said of the vote, that it was the only commodity that one can peddle without a license. But when he wasn't exercising his dry wit, he wrote: "In our country, it is always our first care to see that our people have the opportunity of voting for their choice of men to represent and govern them—we do not permit our great officials to appoint the little officials. We prefer to have so tremendous a power as that in our own hands. We hold it safest to elect our judges and everybody else." No party holds the privilege of dictating to me how I shall vote. If there is any valuable difference between a monarchist and an American, it lies in the theory that the American can decide for himself what is patriotic and what isn't. I claim that difference. "I am the only person," Mark Twain said, "in the 60 millions that is privileged to dictate my patriotism."

Edmund Burke, speaking 100 years before Mark Twain, once said that the only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing. Ladies and gentlemen, on election day, take Mark Twain's advice, act and dictate your own patriotism.

EDDIE ALBERT. There is in the American character a desire to be the best. Some of our favorite expressions include, "Be the

fustest with the mostest," "the will to win." Our buildings are taller, our speedways wider and longer. We've never lost a war and our standard of living is higher than any other nation in the world. And yet in the exercise of our right to vote, we are not first—we are not even a bad second. In racetrack talk, we don't even show. Let me give you some figures that may surprise you. Italy, in recent elections, turned out 93.8 percent of its eligible voters. France, 89 percent. West Germany, 86 percent. Turkey, 87 percent. Denmark, 80 percent. England, almost 79 percent—and the best we've ever done is 62 percent. It's about time we closed up the gap.

On February 27, 1922, the Supreme Court declared by a unanimous declaration that the woman's suffrage 19th amendment was constitutional. Since that time, women have been active in the American political scene and with beneficial effect. Since they were the last to be granted suffrage, it is right that tonight they have the last word. I introduce to you Miss Marian Anderson, concert artist, former U.S. delegate to the United Nations, good will ambassador to the world on behalf of the United States of America.

MISS ANDERSON. I am going to read a short essay on liberty, which combines the words of many great Americans:

"Liberty is the one thing you can't have unless you give it to others and democracy means not I am as good as you are, but rather you are as good as I am. As it is true that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, so it is true that those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must, like all men, undergo the fatigues of supporting it and no man is worth his salt who is not ready at all times to risk his body, to risk his well-being, to risk his life, in a great cause. Liberty will not descend to the people, the people must raise themselves to liberty. It is a blessing that must be earned before it can be enjoyed. And our country has liberty without license, and authority without despotism.

"The sacred rights of mankind are not to be rummaged for among old parchments or rusty records. They are written as with a sunbeam in the whole volume of human destiny by the hand of divinity itself, and can never be erased or obscured by mortal power.

"Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women. When it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women. The spirit of liberty remembers that not even a sparrow falls to earth unheeded. The spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him who, near 2,000 years ago, taught mankind that lesson it has never learned, but has never quite forgotten: that there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest."

EDDIE ALBERT. Miss Anderson's essay included words from William Allen White, Theodore Parker, Thomas Paine, Theodore Roosevelt, Alexander Hamilton, Benjamin Franklin, Cardinal Gibbons, and Judge Learned Hand.

America has always believed in the individual, in his destiny and in his immortality. The individual has been the concern not only of the American statesmen, but the concern of the great American writers. No one has written more eloquently of this than the classic American poet, Walt Whitman, who, in his poem, "A Song of the Rolling Earth," had these words to say:

MARTIN GABEL—
Whoever you are. Motion and reflection are especially for you,
The divine ship sails the divine sea for you.
Host—
Whoever you are, you are he or she for whom the earth is solid and liquid,

You are he or she for whom the sun and moon hang in the sky,
For none more than you are the present and the past,
For none more than you is immortality.
Each man to himself and each woman to herself, is the word of the past and present, and the true word of immortality;

No one can acquire for another—not one,
Not one can grow for another—not one.
The song is to the singer, and comes back most to him,
The teaching is to the teacher, and comes back most to him,
The murder is to the murderer, and comes back most to him,
The theft is to the thief, and comes back most to him,
The love is to the lover, and comes back most to him,
The gift is to the giver, and comes back most to him—it cannot fail,
The oration is to the orator, the acting is to the actor and actress, not to the audience,
And no man understands any greatness or goodness but his own, or the indication of his own.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to announce, for the information of the Senate, that we plan to make Calendar 1035, Senate bill 743, the pending business. We do not anticipate any lengthy debate in connection with it. That bill was introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], on behalf of himself and other Senators; and it would amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, in order to remove the exemption with respect to certain mines employing no more than 14 persons.

When we have completed our action on that bill, we shall proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1319, Senate bill 3058, introduced by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. That bill would amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954. Or we shall consider Calendar 1322, House bill 11510, the corresponding House bill, whichever may be satisfactory to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1035, Senate bill 743.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 743) to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act in order to remove the exemption with respect to certain mines employing no more than 14 individuals.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with an amendment.

ERNIE PYLE MEMORIAL AWARD WINNER ESTABLISHES SCHOLARSHIP

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, earlier in the year I spoke to the Senate about the first woman to receive the Ernie Pyle Memorial Award for journalism and her outstanding work with the Spokesman-Review, in Spokane, Wash. Again I want to speak briefly of Mrs. Dorothy Rochon Powers' great contribution to the field of journalism.

Mrs. Powers has turned over her Ernie Pyle cash award of \$1,000 to the School of Journalism at Montana State University, to provide five \$200 scholarships in coming years to graduates of Anaconda High School, Anaconda, Mont., who wish to major in journalism at the university. The new university award will be known as the C. G. Rochon Scholarship in Journalism, in honor of Mrs. Powers' father, who died in 1944.

This scholarship is a very fine tribute to her alma maters, the University of Montana and the Anaconda school system. Dorothy Powers has a remarkable record in writing and news reporting, and she is to be highly commended for furthering the cause of bringing new and talented young people into the field of journalism.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a news story appearing in the April 21, 1960, issue of the Montana Standard.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOURNALISM SCHOLARSHIP IS ESTABLISHED BY EX-ANACONDA RESIDENT

MISSOULA.—A check for \$1,000 has been presented to the School of Journalism at Montana State University by Mrs. Dorothy Rochon Powers, Spokane newspaperwoman and a 1943 graduate of the school.

She asked that the money be used to provide five \$200 scholarships in coming years to graduates of Anaconda High School who wish to major in journalism at the university. Mrs. Powers also is a graduate of Anaconda High School.

The check, presented to Dean Nathan B. Blumberg of the school of journalism, is the one she received earlier this year when she won the national Ernie Pyle Memorial Award for her writing in the Spokesman-Review. She is the first woman to win the award.

HONORS FATHER

The new university award will be known as the C. G. Rochon Scholarship in Journalism, in honor of Mrs. Powers' father, who died in 1944. Mr. Rochon was clerk of school district No. 10 in Anaconda for several years and encouraged many high-school students to continue their education at the university.

The scholarship is to be awarded on the basis of high-school academic record, professional promise in journalism and financial need. It will be paid in three installments during the recipient's freshman year.

COMMITTEE DESIGNATED

Mrs. Powers asked that the winner be selected by a committee composed of the newspaper adviser and the principal of Anaconda High School and the editor or representative of the Anaconda Standard.

No more than one scholarship is to be awarded annually, Mrs. Powers said, and she

specified that the award need not be made every year if there is no qualified senior interested in preparing for a career in journalism.

Mrs. Powers said she hopes the first award will be made at the Anaconda High School commencement so that the recipient may enroll in the school of journalism next fall.

THE KOREAN SITUATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, President Syngman Rhee, by his resignation, has demonstrated his basic patriotism. Whatever his personal idiosyncrasies, he has been, in moments of crisis, broad enough to recognize that Korea's independence is the essential. It was this realization which drove him into exile many decades ago. It was this realization which prompted him to return at the end of World War II, and to stay on, through the difficult days of the Korean conflict. It was this realization which has prompted him to step down at the present time.

Syngman Rhee's resignation does not end the crisis in Korea; it merely provides an opportunity to end it, and it must be acted upon promptly and decisively. A situation of chaos curbed by martial law will not stand for very long in circumstances such as those which exist in Korea. The chief consequence of a failure to act promptly and decisively may well be a renewal of civil strife, and even international strife, and the end of the prospects for the unity in independence of Korea in this generation.

The first responsibility rests with the Korean people and their leaders—in education, in the professions, and in religion, no less than in politics and in the armed services. If ever there was a time when all the Korean people have needed to cleave together, that time is now. If ever there was a time when prompt action was needed in reorganizing and strengthening the processes of democratic and responsible government that time is now. If ever there was a time when Koreans ought to speak and act in an orderly fashion and with a new dedication to freedom and independence, that time is now. If ever there was a time for soul searching on the part of all those who have been involved in the affairs of the Republic of Korea since the truce of 1953, that time is now.

First. For the Koreans, the immediate need is to work out promptly what constitutional reforms may be necessary to prevent the abuse of power and to insure its responsible exercise. Then, the need is for free and secret elections without intimidation, in the villages no less than in the cities; and if United Nations assistance is essential to that end it should be forthcoming promptly.

Second. For the United Nations, as a whole, the need is to recognize that it has coasted with the Korean issue since 1953 and has contributed little, if anything, through sterile and repetitive debates on this issue year in any year out in the General Assembly, to a solution to the problems of Korea.

Third. For ourselves, the need is to ask ourselves what, if anything, our policies on Korea—direct or through our

leadership in the United Nations—and billions in aid to the South Korean Government have produced since the truce of 1953. Have these policies, this aid, built conditions conducive to a durable peace, or have they served merely as a holding action and one that is now, apparently, in danger of failing even to hold? The inadequacies of these policies, the misuse of this aid have long been apparent, but we need to ask ourselves why it has taken bloody street demonstrations and this grave crisis to bring us to the point of even acknowledging, in an official sense, that something was amiss.

First things must come first and, at this moment, every effort will be required to bring about minimum stability and responsible government through constitutional reform and honest elections in the Republic of Korea. The present white-hot concern should not stop there. I would hope that the new Korean leaders who may emerge, our own policymakers and aid administrators, and the United Nations will look ahead and develop an integrated and determined approach to the inner problems of the Republic of Korea. We need to free this joint effort from any tendencies to accommodate to and to abet political stagnation and corruption. This joint effort and, particularly, any further aid must be used to develop not only an apparently stable situation, as in the past, but a situation which is actually stable because it provides the benefits and hope of responsible progressive government to the Korean people, and hence is supported by them.

I would hope, finally, that all nations most intimately affected by developments in Korea, including the Soviet Union, Communist China, as well as ourselves and the other members of the United Nations forces in Korea, would also look ahead to the end that the entire Korean nation might be reconciled to unity in independence and in peace and, in time, freed of the presence of the forces or the pervasive influence of all outside countries.

NATIONAL DEFENSE—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE THOMAS S. GATES, JR.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on Monday, April 25, 1960, the Secretary of Defense, Thomas S. Gates, Jr., addressed the annual meeting of the Associated Press in New York City.

Secretary Gates' remarks were readily recognized as constituting one of the most important public pronouncements on national defense matters in recent years. The speech received extensive news coverage, and its significance was further underlined by the fact that it was reprinted in its entirety in the New York Times and publications of the Copley Press.

In reading this speech by Secretary Gates, I am impressed by its objectivity and broad-gaged thinking. At a time when attempts have been made—and I am glad to observe that such attempts have been largely unsuccessful—to make political capital out of national defense matters, it is reassuring, but not sur-

prising, that the Secretary of Defense discussed these critical issues with the restraint and dignity that we have come to recognize and admire in the attitude and character of Tom Gates.

The initial portion of this speech contains one of the most mature and penetrating analysis of the nature of the Communist threat that it has been my privilege to read. This analysis places the Communist methods, objectives, and doctrine in proper historical and strategic perspective, and in so doing, Secretary Gates underlines the imperative need for maintaining a defense program that achieves the indispensable balance between combat forces in being, on one hand, and energetic, intelligent, farsighted research and developmental programs on the other. Furthermore, he emphasizes the often inescapable necessity of canceling expensive programs that have been overtaken by events in order to cross the threshold into new methods and weaponry.

There is much reassurance in Secretary Gates' comments on the existence of responsible differences of opinions with respect to military policy, and in his recognition of the value and the necessity for such differences of opinion. At a time when some critics of our Defense Establishment urge that all the military be forced to speak as a perfect chorus, it is good to note the common-sense approach of the Secretary of Defense in refusing to seek unanimity for the sake of unanimity, thus rejecting proposals aimed at throttling sincere, able, and wise opinion on national defense. Such views are in accord with Secretary Gates' strong statement in this speech in support of the Joint Chiefs of Staff system. Such pointed support of this uniquely American device for military planning at the seat of Government is well timed. It is a persuasive and welcome rejection of proposals to destroy the war-proven Joint Chiefs of Staff system by such devices as separating the Joint Chiefs of Staff members from their positions as chiefs of military services.

Secretary Gates does not minimize or disparage the scientific achievements of the Soviet Union in the field of missilery. Yet he places the Soviet accomplishments in their proper relationship with respect to the U.S. position and power. Without equivocation, Secretary Gates makes the accurate and categorical statement that there is no deterrent gap. Also, our limited war forces are strong.

Secretary Gates, in a concise résumé of the great accomplishments our Nation has achieved since 1953—nuclear-powered submarines, the Polaris system, a great long-range jet-powered bomber force, Atlas, Jupiter, Thor, the placing of 20 satellites in orbit, our successful reactions at Lebanon, Quemoy—not only underlines the inherent wisdom, vigor, and strength of our national security policies, but also pointedly rebuts those critics who gratuitously label our Nation as a second-rate power.

Mr. President, because of the historic importance of this speech, I seek unanimous consent to enter it in the RECORD at this time, and I commend it to the attention of all Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE THOMAS S. GATES, JR., BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS, NEW YORK, N.Y., APRIL 25, 1960

Ladies and gentlemen, I greatly appreciate your invitation to participate with you in this meeting today. My associations with you and the many persons who compose the Associated Press have always been interesting and pleasant. Such differences of opinion as we may have had are symbolic of the character of our form of government. I would not want to see the day when our press could not take constructive issue with any government official on any subject.

In planning my statement to you, I thought it best to cover only by time in the Department of Defense. Much has happened since September 1953 when, somewhat by surprise to everyone including myself, I went to work in the Department of the Navy. There have been significant events and dates one does not forget. It is difficult to place these years in sequence. With your permission I will jump over and between them, and first I will begin with the most important date which happened to fall in about the middle of my Washington experience.

On October 5, 1957, the people of the United States were electrified. The Soviet Union had launched and placed in orbit a manmade satellite. Sputnik was born.

This event dramatized in sharp focus the seriousness of the Communist issue. The achievement proved technical competence, and gave tangible and even visual evidence to the competition between two powerful and deeply dedicated ways of life.

Many of us already knew about this. Thousands of words had been written and spoken. A war in Korea had cost us 135,000 casualties. We were spending large sums on defense. We had in being our largest peacetime military forces. We were certainly not unprepared.

Yet, strange as it may have seemed, the American people that day had a rude awakening. They had not understood the enormity of the basic Soviet threat, with all of its implications.

There came a healthy stirring from complacency, and a great worry. In some minds there was fear. Warnings had passed unnoticed. People acted as though it was the first time they had ever heard of the Soviet warmaking potential and Soviet competence. In confusion, they blamed everyone but themselves.

Around the world, the rising young nations stirred also. They began to think, to compare, and to wonder if this day ended hopes and dreams so long in the making.

New nations and old allies looked to the United States—for in the new age, only the United States could provide the leadership, the wealth, and the energy to foster and preserve freedom.

The United States reacted with self-criticism. Doubt and worry produced little that was constructive. A feeling of inferiority swept across the land, a feeling of being second rate began and persisted. No real sacrifices were offered. People were quick to blame, but life went on as usual. Big expense accounts, short working hours, long vacations, and the easy way remained. Men did not change the normal pattern or orient themselves more toward the business of government.

The role of the United States in its free world responsibility was having growing pains at a time we could ill afford them.

Certainly we should not have reacted with complacency, but we should not have gone with a sense of guilt into a process of tearing down our fundamental beliefs and institutions. This was the time to comprehend

fully our defenses and to realize that sound planning existed and anticipated much of the demonstrated Soviet capabilities. The pendulum swung too far.

This was a time for calm determination. Today is such a time, also, and every individual is involved. We must evaluate and believe in our own strengths. Greater knowledge, more work, and a true perspective will confirm our moral values and increase our will. We can ill afford to reward the preacher of the negative, to publicize and acclaim the listing of things that are wrong, with no word on how to improve them. The way of leadership is not to tear down, but to build.

Also, we must understand the Communists better. The U.S.S.R. has deep convictions and relentless programs to rule the world. There are no signs of change. Their system is well developed, composed of skilled, capable people. There is no timetable for their goals. They operate in terms of what Lenin and Stalin called an entire historical era. They can wait.

There is no overriding preference as to tactics or combination of tactics to permit accomplishment of goals. A slowing down here, or a temporary block there merely means a push somewhere else, in all fields—military, economic, psychological, and subversive.

Someday, far in the future, younger generations of Soviets may change the pattern and find new household gods. There is always this hope. However, much time and many events must intervene.

I have recently been to the borders that separate Germany from Czechoslovakia and Austria from Hungary. I wish all Americans could see these miles of Iron Curtain—the plowed road to reveal footprints, the electric and barbed wire fences, the land mines, and the interlocking series of steel watchtowers manned by the guards. I was told that back of this lie other miles of a policed area where special passes are required—a no man's land where no one moves except as authorized.

It is difficult to believe the world can live indefinitely with these series of Iron Curtains that stretch across Europe, Korea, and south Asia. The plowed strips and electric fences must disappear before new generations can build a new structure suitable to the dignity of man.

We must always treasure a faith for the future. Yet today we have an armed truce and an uneasy peace. The United States enters these years as a strong and great power with profound physical and moral integrity. We have firm and true partners. Together with these allies and friends, we testify to and guarantee a new free world.

The experiment in liberty that created this country has been proven. Its progress and growth may be under test, but its fundamental concepts are secure. These are concepts that have stimulated the imagination of all people.

New nations believe in these concepts and hope for the strength to bring them into fruition. New nations will reject the "fenced in" regime of the U.S.S.R.

This is a time to reexamine democracy and make it more sophisticated and adult. This is no time to question our ideals. No time to waver. There will be many probes and tests of our determination. We can bend with some storms and must work and negotiate in the give-and-take of our international position. But when great storms come and threaten our beliefs, then we must be prepared to stand, sacrifice, and fight if we must.

This way of life requires strong, ready military forces. These we have. We must and will insure these forces of continued modernization and power over the longer future.

National defense must always come first. Only from military strength can foreign policy operate. National defense must come first

in dollars, regardless of the level of our gross national product or the status of our annual income and expenditures.

Correct, exact national defense implies unattainable perfection. Proper defense involves sound and balanced judgment. No man or group of men can ever be completely sure the balance is perfect.

Constant change is normal. It takes courage to change, to cancel an expensive program that has been overtaken by events, to close an installation employing trusted competent people, or to abandon a proven military mission of the past in exchange for a better way. Sometimes it takes more courage to do this than to cross a new threshold.

Yet both must be done. This always makes for differences of opinion. Men wise in the ways of the military and of its administration do not deplore these differences. More often than otherwise differences of view are helpful, especially if they spring from experience and knowledge. They bring firmer analysis. Finally, there must be decision, and those who carry the burden of the responsibility must answer "yes" or "no," supervised and guided by the great check-and-balance system implicit in the Constitution of the United States.

We are aware of our responsibility. We know that the security and future of this country lie importantly in our hands. We know that all of our fellow citizens have a deep and lasting interest in what we do and how well we do it.

For these reasons it is wise that we live in a glass house and free debate concerning our affairs takes place in the Congress and in the press. We should acknowledge the significant contribution that experienced Members of Congress and expert analysts of our free press make toward the finalization of defense plans.

I would not recommend any change in this process. We might only hope and suggest that the arguments could become more constructive, based on fuller understanding and more researched knowledge, and that the burdens on a few key individuals and officers within the Department of Defense could be better shared.

The program of the Department of Defense is not created in isolation, but is a principal segment of our total strategy and total national policy. Today this strategy and policy include factors that are political, economic, and psychological, as well as military. A purely military peacetime decision is rare.

Inherent in this total policy is our reliance upon the collective security arrangements we have made worldwide. The military assistance program, which supports our share of these treaties and supplements the economic aid program administered by the Department of State, represents an integral, vital part of our total defense. Military assistance supports the forces of our allies. It means stability. It buys competence and will to resist aggression, and it complements our own forces and bases overseas.

We cannot count on substantive concessions by the Soviet Union. We will push our efforts for a just peace and a lessening of world tensions through controlled arms reduction. We recognize the U.S.S.R. as a formidable power and a tough competitor, a nation that has made great progress and will continue to grow.

We see no change in their objectives. Their efforts to make us believe otherwise are but tactics used for whatever temporary benefit or propaganda advantage is deemed valuable at the time.

We repeatedly analyze and war-game the relative military strength of the Soviet Union and the United States. These studies deny any impression that we have been overtaken militarily or that we are second best. Such an impression is not supported by the fact.

Under our present and planned defense, no rational leader of the Soviet Union could make a decision to attack the United States since such an attack would guarantee the destruction of his own country. This is our conclusion, and it is supported by all of the principal civilian, military, and scientific advisers to the President. We assert firmly that no gap exists in our deterrent posture.

The mission of the Department of Defense includes two categories of priority: First, we must be prepared to deter general war and retaliate effectively and conclusively if it should occur.

Second, we must be prepared for military actions of varying degrees and sizes anywhere in the world, and be able to contain quickly such action. We must put out the fire of limited war in situations that may range all the way from another Korea-sized conflict to one involving a small number of infantry or marines.

These obligations, combined with all the factors that are inherent in our national policy, call for balanced U.S. forces of great variety and dimension and demand difficult judgment and continuous decision.

The pace of scientific progress has been fast, and the military transition is great. Flexibility has become an essential element in our planning. Our programs must evolve and take shape independently of the time cycles of the annual budget, and regardless of fluctuations in the political temperature.

The Department of Defense is big and complex. Over the years there have been important improvements in its management. More can be made, but we can point to significant accomplishments. The Reorganization Act of 1958 represents the latest statutory change. It would be wise to let the impact of this act have its effect before another change is made. The greater centralization of command and authority implicit in this act, with the line of military command running through the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the unified commands, is functioning well. It will continue to prove more effective as time goes on. I strongly support the Joint Chiefs of Staff system, and believe we have found a formula that will improve its operation.

An important aspect of the 1958 act, which is also having beneficial effects, was the creation of the Office of Director of Defense Research and Engineering. This Office, now headed by Dr. Herbert York, supervises and assigns priority to research work which accounts for close to \$6 billion of our defense budget. Since most of our present effort in space is still in the research and development stage, the military portions of the Nation's space activity are also largely within the responsibilities of this Office.

The exploration of space and its relation to military uses has been greatly misunderstood. It is one thing to say that the United States has lagged in the ability to put large payloads into space, and quite another thing to say that the United States lags in its overall military programs.

Sputnik was a tremendous scientific feat. Its success, along with subsequent successful Soviet efforts in outer space, produced a psychological impact on all peoples that is of the utmost importance. These dramatic feats have been possible because the U.S.S.R. has developed high thrust engines which can boost large payloads into deep space.

Prior to 1954 the United States, and presumably the Soviets, were interested in developing an intercontinental missile. At that time, based on then existing heavy warheads, our scientists estimated we would need a rocket of truly prodigious power. The technical difficulties were so extreme that little interest was shown. Late in 1953, however, greatly improved thermonuclear weapon design made it possible to produce a warhead of relatively small size without

sacrifice of destructive power. It then became feasible to develop an ICBM using a rocket of some 360,000 pounds thrust—and the Atlas design was pushed forward on that basis.

Meanwhile, the Soviets apparently elected to go ahead with the development of an ICBM based on a larger booster. They did develop an engine which produced an estimated 600,000- to 800,000-pound thrust.

The decision regarding Atlas was a correct one militarily. The Atlas is a smaller missile, easier to handle, and less expensive. It will carry a large yield nuclear warhead to ranges fully adequate to reach all major targets. From this decision to stay with the smaller boosters has come our present ICBM program—Atlas, Titan, Minuteman, and Polaris.

Sticking with big engines, big missiles, and big warheads ironically gave the Soviet a byproduct of high-thrust rocket engines and thus space probes of importance for scientific and prestige purposes. We have no military requirement for such engines. We can develop our family of weapons and produce our presently required military satellites without them. In our judgment the present ICBM boosters, or perhaps updated versions of them, will suffice for any of our unmanned military satellite systems.

We should clearly separate space probes from military weapons such as ICBM's. Some day, undoubtedly, other military requirements may develop in space which will require big boosters and we, therefore, have great interest in seeing the United States develop such engines. But no informed person can downgrade U.S. military power because of Sputnik or even a landing on the moon. Rather, we should take great pride in our accomplishments.

I came to the Pentagon in September of 1953. In the short span of one man's service, let us look at what has happened. In 1953 no ship afloat was powered by atomic energy. Today we have 9 nuclear submarines already in commission and 23 under construction or conversion. Under construction also is a nuclear-powered carrier, a nuclear-powered cruiser, and a nuclear-powered frigate. The *Nautilus* has cruised under the North Pole, followed by the *Skate*; the *Sea-wolf* has stayed under water for an unprecedented 60 days. The nuclear-powered submarine has revolutionized sea warfare and rightly caught the imagination of the world.

In 1953 the Polaris system was merely a dream. This year it becomes a reality, as 2 of these submarines, each capable of firing 16 atomic tipped missiles while submerged, join our active defense forces.

In 1953 an airplane which was expected for the first time to operate at speeds greater than the speed of sound was in the very early design stage. Today Mach 2 aircraft are part of our regular forces, and a Mach 3 plane is in our active research and development program.

In 1953 we were devoting our full energies to the development of airbreathing missiles such as the Snark and Navaho. The ballistic missile—Atlas—was a concept only. It was surrounded by doubters; its proponents asserted it could be operational by 1965. Today the first Atlases are in position on the Pacific coast, with an astonishing record of successful test firings, and a proved accuracy that has far exceeded the hopes of even a year ago. Meanwhile, the early airbreathing missiles have been developed, been produced, become operational, and then been superseded in the swift progress of technology.

In 1953 the intermediate range ballistic missiles, Jupiter and Thor, were not even contemplated. Today the Thor is in the hands of our allies in the United Kingdom,

and it was a Jupiter booster which in 1958 launched this Nation's first satellite into space.

Since that first launching, the United States has successfully put 20 satellites into orbit, compared with a total of six space vehicles for the Soviets. Today, as military or civilian projects, we have 11 still in space, including one which is pioneering weather forecasting through taking pictures of cloud covering, one that is contributing to new advances in navigation, and one that, from more than 5 million miles away, has been sending us information which has significantly expanded the sum total of human knowledge regarding outer space. The two Soviet objects now remaining in space are transmitting no messages.

The launching of a satellite, which 2 years ago made headlines throughout the world, does well today if it makes page one. Anti-aircraft and tactical missiles, air defense and offensive systems, come out of the drawing boards and into ships, planes, and installations, and are taken for granted.

These changes have occurred in less than 7 years—the time that used to be regarded as par for the course in the development of a fighter aircraft.

Meanwhile, with this impressive effort in research and engineering, our forces in being have demonstrated their ability to react quickly and effectively to situations that have arisen, such as those at Lebanon and Quemoy. We have been a strong force in keeping the peace.

Who says this is a backward, second-class military record? I say it is superb.

You of the press have great responsibilities in the field of maintaining our freedom and the concern and interest of all of our citizens. In publishing news of our relative strengths and weaknesses, I only urge you to portray the factual, overall picture, and to consider all aspects of the great mission with which we in Defense are charged. Only through an informed public can we insure that freedom in the long run will triumph.

I urge you to foster a better understanding of what faces us and of our preparation to meet the future. Take our minds away from straw men and false issues, and restore self confidence and faith. Bring to our people a realization that the interests of our country must come first, always. Make us forget and settle differences of lesser importance.

Such actions and leadership on your part will produce concrete, constructive ideas, restore a rebirth of values, and sharpen again the firmness, fitness, and fortitude which are our heritage from the day a shot was fired beside a small bridge in Concord, Mass.

It must be clear to you, as well as to all of our citizens, that as we approach the summit and meetings of great significance that will follow, we must be strong. This strength is real. It is not a facade. Confidence in it must exist on the part of all of our citizens.

THE FRANKING PRIVILEGE BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS—POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in view of the apparent difficulty of some of our friends of the fourth estate in understanding the amendment offered last Monday by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the then pending Post Office appropriations bill, relating to what he termed the distribution of junk mail without addresses, the

chairman of the subcommittee which considered that appropriation desires to repeat what he distinctly said on last Monday concerning what was involved. At that time he said that the amendment of the Senator from Delaware was not necessary. He said that the Solicitor General of the Post Office Department had ruled that the mere repetition in the appropriation bill of the statutory authority for the use of franked mail by Members of the Congress did not in any way, shape, or form compel the Post Office Department to change its existing regulation which prohibited the distribution of franked mail that was unaddressed in cities and towns which had street delivery.

But when the amendment was offered, the chairman of the subcommittee had the clerk of the committee again call the Postmaster General on the telephone, and he received the reply that the Department's position had not changed; that the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware was not needed; and that he had so informed the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. President, far be it for me to accuse any of our friends of the press of putting the Appropriations Committee in a false light, but the whole matter is fully set out on page 8619 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, April 25, 1960. Yet not a word appeared in the press to the effect that the committee was informed by the Post Office Department that the language framed by the Department and put in the committee report was all that was necessary to protect the Department from what was only a request—not a law, but only a request—in the House report that the Postmaster General adopt a regulation with respect to the delivery of unaddressed mail.

In conclusion, after outlining very fully those reasons, the chairman of the subcommittee said that to begin with, the Senator from Virginia is willing to accept the amendment, but on a different theory from that which has been presented to the Senate. This is the language contained in the House report.

Then I went on to say that all this amendment did—and that is still the fact—was to put in conference what we had taken care of in the committee report, and now we have just one more issue to debate with the House conferees, because we had the matter fully covered in a way that could not be raised in conference, whereas the amendment, taking out language of the bill itself, must be argued in conference and must be insisted on by the Senate conferees. There is the possibility, of course, that the House conferees might not agree to take the language out. The conferees might go back for a separate vote in the House. This might require a separate vote in the Senate. After it is all done, we get back to where the committee was in the first instance.

Mr. President, I think the RECORD was perfectly clear on Monday on that issue. Naturally, I regret that no member of the press who was handling this mat-

ter saw fit to let the public know that they were not going to be gouged by a new method of free delivery through failure of the Senate committee to protect them and that their protection was not dependent upon the very able and alert Senator from Delaware and the amendment he offered.

I repeat, the public was fully protected in this matter. The amendment offered added nothing to the bill except the possibility of an additional fight in conference to sustain that particular amendment.

MINE SAFETY WILL SAVE LIVES

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Americans everywhere, and especially those in the coal mining regions of the Nation, were shocked at the reports of recent coal mine disasters. I express the hope that we in the Senate will pass the coal mine safety bill by unanimous vote.

Since 1865 Congress has recognized the hazardous nature of coal mining. Over the years we have seen the passage of legislation designed to remove the dangers. Despite this fact, mining still remains a hazardous occupation.

Major accidents and disasters can be prevented if there is strict adherence to safety standards. Recognizing this fact, Congress in 1952 enacted legislation providing for mine safety inspectors and the establishment of uniform safety standards.

However, in writing the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, Congress exempted mines employing 14 men or less. These mines are usually referred to as title I mines.

Mr. President, I assert that a man's life is just as precious and deserving of protection whether he works in an underground mine employing 10 people or 20 people or 100 people.

There is no logic in applying mine safety rules to mines employing 15 or more persons and not applying those same rules to mines employing 14 or less. The life of the laborer in the larger mine is no more worthy of protection than the life of his fellow worker in the smaller one.

Mr. President, during the month of April alone, six coal miners were killed in two widely separated tragic accidents in title I mines. If safety rules that apply to larger mines had applied to those worked in by these six men, they might be alive today.

I have received a telegram on this subject sent to me by the outstanding president of the United Mine Workers of America, Thomas Kennedy. The message in this telegram is worthy of our serious consideration.

Mr. President, S. 743, introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], will, if enacted, remedy this dangerous loophole in our mine safety laws. It is fair to the mine operators as well as to the mineworkers.

The Senate will today consider this needed proposed legislation. Its aim is to save lives.

Mr. President, if enacted into law, S. 743 will do just that. It will also quiet the fear in the heart of every wife and every child of a mineworker when he leaves for work in the morning. It will make life safer and happier for many Americans at no cost to the rest of us. I urge its speedy passage in both branches of the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the telegram on this subject sent to me by the outstanding president of the United Mine Workers of America, Thomas Kennedy.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., April 13, 1960.
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG,
Washington, D.C.:

Six coal miners were killed in title I mines Saturday, April 9, three in Kentucky and three in Maryland. Had Congress passed S. 743 during the 1st session of the 86th Congress these coal miners could be alive today. S. 743 will shortly be considered by the Senate. I hope your vote will be for the protection and saving of human life.

THOMAS KENNEDY,
President, United Mine Workers of America.

WHY BIG INDUSTRY IS GOING "SMALL TOWN"

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the extent to which industry is turning to America's small towns, and even to the countryside, for sites for new plants, is outlined in a special report carried in the U.S. News & World Report of December 21, 1959. Small communities out across the land should take heart, and take every practical step to strengthen the trend.

I ask unanimous consent that the report, entitled "Why Big Industry Is Going 'Small Town,'" be printed in the RECORD.

An example of savings from new plants in small towns

An office-equipment manufacturer in an eastern city, planning to expand, found that big savings could be made with a new plant. Four sites in small midwestern communities were considered. What comparisons showed about yearly operating costs:

	Present factory in the East	Site A, Midwest factory	Site B, Midwest factory	Site C, Midwest factory	Site D, Midwest factory
Labor	\$12,106,000	\$10,054,000	\$10,548,000	\$10,934,000	\$11,092,000
Overhead (including local taxes)	1,190,000	618,000	602,000	636,000	662,000
Freight costs	507,000	482,000	366,000	360,000	338,000
Utilities	204,000	248,000	214,000	236,000	246,000
Total	14,007,000	11,352,000	11,730,000	12,166,000	12,338,000
Estimated yearly savings at new plant		2,655,000	2,277,000	1,841,000	1,669,000
Savings as percent of costs at present factory		19	16.3	13.1	11.3

Source: Survey by Fantus Factory Locating Service.

That estimate comes from Leonard C. Yaseen, senior partner in the Fantus Factory Locating Service, which has found sites for more than 1,500 industrial plants. Says Mr. Yaseen:

"One of the most significant developments of the past decade has been the rise of small cities as the industrial centers of America. At the same time, the large, traditional man-

ufacturing cities of the United States have lost ground rapidly."

A Fantus study notes that such big centers as New York, Detroit, Providence, Pittsburgh, the Newark-Jersey City area of New Jersey, and the Albany-Schenectady-Troy area of New York State all have lost industry since 1950. At the same time, many small communities, particularly in the South, the

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the U.S. News & World Report]
SPECIAL REPORT—WHY BIG INDUSTRY IS GOING
"SMALL TOWN"

A new Government study highlights this important trend in U.S. industry: More and more companies are building plants away from the big cities. This signals more jobs, better income for people in small communities.

U.S. industry is turning more and more to small towns—and even the open countryside—as a place to build new plants. As a result, job opportunities in many small communities across the country are on the increase.

In some rural areas, new industries are giving employment to people who used to make their living from farming. In other places, payrolls from the new plants are boosting retail trade and lifting the standard of living of local residents.

These points are borne out by an official study just completed by the Business and Defense Services Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce. The study shows that cities and towns with populations of 50,000 or below now provide more than 25 percent of all the employment in the Nation's manufacturing industries.

There is no exact comparison with earlier periods, because this is the first such survey the Government has made. It is based on a special tabulation of statistics gathered from the census of manufacturing concerns, covering 1954.

A QUICKENING PACE

Commerce Department officials say that the rate of industry's movement to small towns and suburban areas has been increasing steadily in recent years. This trend is continuing, even though a majority of all U.S. industry still is concentrated in or near big cities.

Life insurance companies, research laboratories and data-processing centers are joining manufacturing firms in the trek to the country.

One plant-location specialist says that, since the end of World War II, more than 90 percent of all new factories have been built in communities of less than 50,000 population.

Midwest, and along the Pacific coast, have registered sharp gains in factory jobs.

SIGNS OF THE TREND

A check of business executives and industrial development authorities by U.S. News & World Report underlines the extent of industry's move toward the open spaces.

From William P. Rock of the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission comes this comment: "There's no question about the trend to smaller communities. In the past 4 years, we have located 400 new industries in Arkansas, and they are spread over every county in the State, including areas that are predominantly rural."

Kentucky reports that, out of 649 new plants built or planned in Kentucky in the period 1948 to 1959—at a cost of nearly \$2 billion—a total of 478, or 74 percent, were located in communities with less than 50,000 population.

That report comes from George W. Hubley, Jr., president of the Association of State Planning and Development Agencies and former Kentucky commissioner of economic development. "Many of Kentucky's new plants are in towns of less than 5,000," says Mr. Hubley, who recently was named director of industrial development for the State of Maryland. A striking example, he adds, is the \$10 million plant of General Tire & Rubber Co. now under construction in an open field on the outskirts of Mayfield, Ky., a city of 9,000.

B. R. Fuller, Jr., industrial development commissioner of Florida, says:

"Florida in 1957 started a new program to help our rural communities gain new industry. Naturally we don't expect to develop new payrolls overnight. But we are encouraged by the fact that, in the 49 rural counties in the program, the number of new manufacturing plants brought in during the first half of this year was double that of the first half of 1958, and the number of new jobs created was three times as high."

The biggest industrial development in Florida so far this year, Mr. Fuller notes, is a new \$13.5 million plant for corrugated paperboard in Port St. Joe, a community of about 6,000 people.

In Vermont, whose largest city, Burlington, has a population of only 35,000, strong efforts are being made to lure industry. W. E. Bermingham, managing director of the Vermont Industrial Development Commission, notes that national companies coming into Vermont or expanding operations there, have added 8 millions to annual payrolls in the State over the past 5 years, and have boosted total employment by 2,000 people.

"We think we have a competitive edge in attracting new plants, because our natural beauty and our recreational facilities make people want to live here, and to live in Vermont is to work hard," says Mr. Bermingham.

WHY THEY MOVE

There are several reasons why companies are seeking plant sites in the country or in small towns. The reasons vary from industry to industry and from company to company.

MANPOWER

Some companies find that the supply of labor is more abundant and more productive in less-industrialized areas, particularly in rural communities where farm mechanization has cut the number of jobs in agriculture.

Says an executive of a major chemical-processing company: "We try to put our new plants in small communities whenever we can. For one thing, we find the labor situation more stable than in larger cities. There is less trouble with strikes, mass picketing, with agitation of one sort or another. Then, too, we prefer to train our workers from scratch, and we have found the workers in

small communities most adaptable. They don't have bad habits to unlearn."

In many rural areas where new plants have been established, workers continue to do part-time farming when they're not working a plant shift. An executive of the Du Pont Co. notes that workers at its Orton plant at Camden, S.C., commute up to 50 miles to their jobs, then drive back home to put in a few hours on the land.

COSTS

The prospect of substantial savings in operating costs often lures a plant to a smaller community.

According to Mr. Yaseen, "More and more industries are finding that their costs—for labor, transportation, fringe benefits, plant overhead, and utilities—are often lower in smaller communities than in big cities."

The chart on page 87 shows you how the possibility of cutting production costs can influence the choice of a factory site. The figures are derived from an actual survey made by the Fantus organization for one of its clients, a manufacturer of office equipment with headquarters in an Eastern city.

This company, with an outmoded factory and inefficient plant layout, found it could have saved almost 10 percent in annual costs just by putting up a more efficient plant near its present location. But no space was available for expansion there, so the company decided to move to a less crowded area.

After checking many possibilities, the company narrowed its choices to communities in four Midwestern States, where annual savings of 12 percent to 19 percent could be made on costs of labor, freight, and overhead. These estimated savings did not include possible additional savings on State income taxes and unemployment-compensation costs.

ELBOW ROOM

Still another reason for moving to the open country is the availability of large plant sites with room for future expansion. F. S. Dickinson, Jr., president of Becton, Dickinson & Co., Rutherford, N.J., says the "priceless commodity of space" was what led his concern, a manufacturer of medical instruments, to pick a site at Columbus, Nebr. The company put up a plant on an industrial tract outside the city limits, where taxes are low and where there is plenty of room for future growth.

THE "GOOD LIFE"

Most companies nowadays look for plant sites where living conditions are pleasant. C. J. Lawson, Jr., director of manufacturing services for International Business Machines Corp., explains that IBM, in locating a plant, considers accessibility to markets, availability of manpower, and tax and utility rates.

"But beyond this," he says, "we are most concerned with the character of the community—its cultural, educational, and recreational facilities. We ask ourselves if it is an attractive place in which our employees would like to live and raise their families. In our evaluation of these factors, we have found generally that the smaller community provides the most advantages, both to the company and to the individual employee."

New high-speed turnpikes and expressways furnish an incentive for plants to locate in rural or semirural surroundings, where there is plenty of parking space for workers' cars and easy access to larger centers of population.

WHO MOVES, WHO DOESN'T

For communities that are interested in attracting new industries, the new study by the Commerce Department offers some tips. It lists 74 types of business that seem to prefer locating in smaller cities or towns. Included are companies making wood

and worsted fabrics, seamless hosiery, wood furniture, men's and boys' underwear, paper and paperboard, packaged sea food, synthetic fibers, flat glass, home-laundry equipment, and concentrated milk.

Some other types of business seem to favor staying in the big cities, the study indicates. Included in this group are printing and publishing, rubber products, fabricated metals, instruments, machine tools, paints, photo equipment, fur goods, and many varieties of food processing.

Even so, there is evidence that smalltown locations are appealing increasingly to many business concerns. The prospect for the years ahead is that the Nation's rural areas will get a still larger number of business concerns of many kinds.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GROUPS SLOW TO REPLY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the Utah Committee on Industrial and Employment Planning is a statewide committee appointed by the Governor to establish and promote employment expansion through orderly industrial development. It is doing a splendid job.

In a recent copy of the Utah Industrial Development Newsletter, published by the committee, there is an excellent discussion of community shortcomings in meeting out-of-State inquiries about local sites for new industry. I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from this discussion, entitled "Community Development Groups Slow To Reply," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GROUPS SLOW TO REPLY

We feel quite certain that the following doesn't apply to any of our industrial development groups in Utah, but it is rather surprising to learn that across the Nation, "a substantial percentage of local groups do a miserable job of responding to industrial inquiries."

Editors of Industrial Development & Manufacturers Record, leading national publication in the field of industrial planning and expansion, made this charge in reporting on their experience referring requests for plant location information to community development organizations. A portion of their report follows:

"We on the staff of ID have long regarded ourselves as staunch defenders and advocates of local community development organizations. We point with pride to their progress and continually remind industry to use their services.

"But there are times when we are more than a little discouraged by some of the groups we are striving to support. In fact, their action—or lack of it—is beyond our understanding.

"Example type I: We have an inquiry from firm listing 20 communities of interest, asking for site proposal within 15 days. We wire communities, stressing urgency. Nine communities meet the deadline.

"Example type II: We refer an inquiry to a community, indicating firm wants specific preliminary data without revealing identity. Community group replies: 'We're sure we have what this firm wants—just tell them to come and see us.'

"We were amazed on one occasion to receive a letter from an industrialist asking our aid in contacting an advertiser—said he had written twice for site data, but still hadn't received an answer. Why, the reader asked, was this group spending its good money for advertising space?"

"While we've made no exhaustive survey and claim no mathematical accuracy, our guess is that a genuine site query going out to 100 community groups might produce results somewhat as follows:

"Fifteen would reply quickly with well-planned, tailored proposals.

"Forty would respond promptly with form letters and routine literature.

"Twenty would reply too slowly to receive most favorable consideration.

"Ten would fail to reply due to organizational confusion and buck passing.

"Five would send material doing their cause more harm than good.

"One explanation for such poor response is that many local groups get excited only when the query comes to them direct from the industrial prospect. They just don't exert themselves to respond to anonymous inquiries referred by railroads, State agencies, utilities, etc.

"This may be human nature, but it's not good business.

"Successful developers have learned that it pays to take advantage of every opportunity to present their case to interested parties. You never know where your next lead is going to originate."

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the Salt Lake Tribune on Monday, April 11, 1960, published another telling editorial on the problem of control of pollution of our streams. After the President vetoed the water pollution bill, the Salt Lake Tribune published several editorials on this subject, this one being entitled "Congress Should Try Again on Pollution." This is an excellent discussion of the point, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS SHOULD TRY AGAIN ON POLLUTION

The lower House of Congress has restored a \$25 million cut in the Federal aid program for sewage treatment works during the next fiscal year.

The administration budget provided only \$20 million as the Federal Government's share of the national pollution control program begun in 1956. Raising the amount back to the \$45 million level of the last 3 years, the Appropriations Committee declared: "The amount requested * * * is completely unrealistic in view of the urgency of need and the growing hazard of water pollution. * * * Nor does the argument that it is a local problem, and not a Federal responsibility, hold up under objective analysis.

"It is seldom that the locality which builds the waste treatment plant gains more than a small part of the advantages that result. It is other communities downstream and often even in a different State that really benefit."

If the Senate accepts the House figure the Federal grants will continue next year as in the past. Utah communities have been receiving \$592,275 annually under the program, with local funds paying 70 percent of the cost and the Federal Government 30 percent. If the recommended slash is carried out, programs in Utah would be cut back to \$236,910 next year.

The picture of national water pollution needs is emphasized in a report by the Public Health Service, drawn for the Senate Select Committee on National Resources. This report should jolt everyone into greater effort to abate industrial and human pollution.

Water use in the country is increasing with the rapid population growth. And within 20 years the residents of many areas will have to drink water that previously has been used again and again, the report warns.

This means that great improvements will have to be made in sewage and water purification techniques, in addition to more widespread treatment. Present methods do not remove many of the new types of chemicals—household detergents, insecticides, and industrial wastes.

The Public Health Service urges that highest priority be given scientific research dealing with this knotty problem.

It will cost \$9 billion to do what should be done to abate pollution in the Nation in the next 5 years, the report says. Twenty-nine hundred municipalities will have to build sewage-treatment plants and 2,730 others will have to enlarge or modernize theirs. More than 6,000 industrial factories will have to control their wastes.

Communities which fail to clean up their water supplies will find their futures adversely affected and their growth curtailed. For example, Kansas City is now feeling the pinch of punitive measures because its officials ignored Public Health Service and Missouri Pollution Board's orders to clean up.

Congress should try again to pass a workable water-pollution bill. The new bill should take into consideration the President's veto message suggestion that tighter measures be taken to halt pollution. This will call for more severe penalties.

Pollution and water supply problems often can be handled better on a watershed or river system.

Hence, Federal incentives should be provided for both local and regional sewage work, particularly where it is demonstrated that the cleanup program is required and the Government grants and other incentives are needed. Congress should review the wisdom of restricting the pollution grants to small communities. In many cases the middle-sized and large cities are the worst off financially, in tighter tax straitjackets and have equally severe sanitation problems.

MASS TRANSPORTATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, last month when I introduced a bill, S. 3278, to help improve mass transportation services in metropolitan areas, I tried to stress the broad-scale national interest in this problem which far transcends the convenience of our railroad commuters, important as that may be.

I tried to point out that the existence of adequate, modern mass transportation facilities is vitally important from the standpoint of preserving the wealth- and revenue-producing capacity of our major metropolitan areas which may otherwise strangle from traffic congestion and land waste.

It is also important from the standpoint of protecting our country's huge investment in the Federal highway program, an investment that will inevitably soar to fantastic heights if we lose our present mass transit services.

And it is vitally important from the standpoint of insuring the free flow of freight in interstate commerce, which will be subject to the same costly delays in urban areas because of traffic paralysis.

This last point was recently substantiated by Stanley Berge, professor of transportation at Northwestern Univer-

sity, who wrote in the May issue of the Atlantic Monthly:

A fact too often overlooked in discussions of the metropolitan transportation problem is that efficient movement of freight within and across the urban area is just as important as efficient movement of passengers. Hence, any future planning for railroad commuter services and other passenger services should aim at maximum utilization of tracks, equipment, and other facilities by both freight and passenger trains.

In his article Mr. Berge discusses two advancements that would materially improve our rail transportation systems: the elimination of inefficient stub-end railroad terminal stations to be replaced by through stations and the development of a new railroad electrification program, which would cut investment and maintenance costs while improving efficiency and reliability.

These are the kinds of capital improvements that my bill is designed to assist, and I think there is no question that the sooner we start helping our State and local governments to make these kinds of investments, the more money we will save in the long run. This is the kind of prudent expenditure that is vitally needed and that can only be considered an asset on the ledgers of our Nation's strength and security.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this informative article by Mr. Berge be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Atlantic Monthly, May 1960]

HOW COMMUTERS CAN HAVE THEIR TRAINS

(By Stanley Berge)

(Commuter service on public transportation has become one of the most besetting problems of our time. For a constructive solution we have turned to Stanley Berge, professor of transportation at Northwestern University School of Business. Mr. Berge has made special field studies of the railroad situation in six of our large American cities and has made three trips to Europe to collect data bearing on the subject.)

The great cities of today owe much of their growth and present stature to the railroads which have served them for upward of a century. But as the cities outgrow their past and extend into the suburbs, people everywhere are asking in some anxiety whether there is any way the railroads can meet the new challenge.

The disorganized commuter railroads often give the impression that they do not even wish to participate in future metropolitan transportation. While the press publishes gushing predictions of big plans for motor transport and aviation, one looks in vain for a single enthusiastic, imaginative proposal for large-scale improvement in coordinated metropolitan railroad service. Instead of getting together and pooling their resources to develop a dramatic long-range plan, even the most strategic railroads serving our great cities seem to be going it alone. The newspapers continually report suburban fare increases, train curtailments, and complaints about subsidized competition and unfair taxes. Occasionally there is an encouraging announcement that an individual road has introduced new suburban coaches to replace decrepit old rattlers. But where is there any indication that the railroads, as a group, have any radical improve-

ments in mind for their metropolitan commuter services; their medium-distance intercity passenger services, where they still have a fighting chance; or their through metropolitan freight service, where the present pace of rail performance is almost a joke?

In fact, most railroad managements today are resigned to the idea that insofar as metropolitan transportation is concerned, they are a declining industry. All of their big plans, it seems, are geared to a concept that the future of the railroads is limited solely to the carriage of long-distance intercity bulk freight.

Whether they realize it or not, the strategic rail lines in our large cities possess locational and technical advantages not possessed by any other form of transport. If by some magic injection these despondent carriers were aroused, it could be demonstrated that big cities need coordinated railroads quite as much as coordinated highways and air and water transport.

A fact too often overlooked in discussions of the metropolitan transportation problem is that efficient movement of freight within and across the urban area is just as important as efficient movement of passengers. Hence, any future planning for railroad commuter services and other passenger services should aim at maximum utilization of tracks, equipment, and other facilities by both freight and passenger trains. Is this being done today? The answer is "No." Railroad executives and city planners are still struggling with proposals for commuter facilities and for rapid-transit extensions exclusively to take care of passenger traffic. It is not surprising that most of these plans are slow to get public acceptance. Their failure to obtain financial and general support is primarily the result of a fundamental fallacy in metropolitan transportation planning; namely, that because no more than 20 hours per week of use can be expected of commuter railroad and rapid-transit facilities and personnel, such facilities can never be made self-supporting and their operation will always incur a deficit. Since deficits must be carried either by taxpayers, in the case of transit lines, or by shippers and stockholders, in the case of commuter railroads, it is hardly to be expected that metropolitan transportation plans involving extensive deficit financing should be greeted with widespread enthusiasm. In our enterprise system, the public is apt to look askance at any industry, even in the public service, which openly declares that it cannot exist without direct public subsidies on a permanent basis.

Why is it that so many people think of the metropolitan transportation problem simply as a mass-transit problem? To be sure, mass transit by bus and rapid-transit lines is certainly a vital part of urban passenger transportation, but unfortunately it is not suitable for long-distance extensions, as metropolitan travel reaches out 50 miles or more from the central business district. Neither are mass-transit facilities and equipment particularly suited to the transport of mail, express, and freight, which must also be carried if metropolitan rail lines are to become self-supporting. Hence, rather than extend rapid-transit lines far out of the central cities into thin-density territory, why not avoid duplication, waste, and frustration by assigning responsibility for relatively long distance metropolitan transport of both passengers and freight to coordinated metropolitan railroad systems and turn over the closely spaced stops and high-density urban transport of passengers to the transit lines. The railroads would thus become a super rapid transit network which could be effectively coordinated with an inner network of urban transit services.

BREAKING THE RAILROAD BOTTLENECKS

One day there will be a great awakening in one of our large metropolitan cities. The

present bottleneck of stub-end railroad terminal stations will be broken, enabling trains to move freely through the central city, making stops at a series of convenient platform stations instead of forcing all passengers to enter and leave all trains at a single, congested, downtown location. The old-fashioned, inefficient, stub-end terminal stations in the hearts of most large cities are inherited from the 19th century. Further confusion results when cities are served by two or more stub-end stations which, in view of modern needs, are rather inconveniently located.

From the standpoint of the railroads, stub-end terminal stations are both inefficient and wasteful of space, equipment, and manpower. Through-station tracks can handle at least four times as many trains and passengers per hour as stub-end-station tracks. In Chicago, for instance, 45 multiple-unit trains can be operated by the electrified Illinois Central suburban line to and from its stub-end terminal station at Randolph Street in a single rush hour. Since the station contains six stub-end tracks, this means an average of approximately seven trains per track per hour. By way of comparison, the State Street subway line of the Chicago Transit Authority averages 30 trains per track during a single rush hour, and in addition offers the passenger a number of convenient platform station stops. In this case, the subway and the railroad both use self-propelled, electric, multiple-unit trains with double-end controls exclusively, yet there appears to be a fourfold gain in efficiency resulting from the through-station operation compared with the stub-end-station operation.

Moreover, the average efficiency of stub-end railroad terminals is still further impaired by the fact that most commuter railroads operate trains propelled by locomotives. Unless the double-end push-pull type of control is provided, it is necessary to engage in extensive—and expensive—switching operations in and out of the terminal station simply to put the locomotive at the head end of each train. Before its recent inauguration of push-pull suburban trains, the Chicago & North Western's entire 16-track stub-end station at Madison Street in Chicago could accommodate only 60 train movements during a single rush hour—no more than are handled in the same hour on just the 2 through tracks of the transit authority's State Street subway line.

The distance covered in backup and turnaround train movements is often considerable. The Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific, for instance, using one end of the stub-end Chicago Union Station, is compelled to back passenger trains 3 miles to the Western Avenue coachyard, turn them around, and again back them 3 miles into the station. This procedure not only involves a great waste of track and station capacity but is equally wasteful of equipment and crewtime.

To sum up: Obsolete stub-end railway terminals must give way to efficient platform stations located on unified through-track systems, thus permitting effective coordination of metropolitan railway operations. In other words, it is high time that the principle of continuous flow should be applied in metropolitan railroad networks just as it has been applied in the development of expressways and rapid-transit lines. It is no more logical, for example, to stop all New York Central & New Haven passenger trains at a brick wall in Grand Central Terminal than it would be to stop all subway trains at a brick wall under Times Square, or to bottle up all motor vehicles using the Lincoln Tunnel in a giant downtown parking lot.

THROUGH TRAFFIC WITHOUT SUBSIDIES

The advantages of through stations on connected tracks are evident in the Pennsylvania Railroad's 30th Street and North Phila-

delphia stations in Philadelphia, as well as in the through-track arrangement of Penn Station in New York. Outside the United States, metropolitan Tokyo has one of the best arrangements of unified tracks and stations. Stations in the Netherlands are almost without exception of the through type. Stub-end stations in Brussels have recently been rebuilt as through stations by linking tracks in a crosstown tunnel. A tunnel has just been completed to link the rail lines in Madrid; and the French are studying a tunnel plan to link the principal rail lines and eliminate major stub-end stations in Paris. Not the least of the advantages of such continuous-flow railway networks is that they are useful for freight, mail, and express trains, as well as for commuter trains and intercity passenger trains. They are thus much more likely to achieve sufficient utilization to pay their way without the need for direct subsidies from the taxpayers.

Consider the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut metropolitan area. The New Jersey railroads, with the exception of the Pennsylvania, all terminate in stub-end stations west of the Hudson River. Even the Pennsylvania, whose two tunnels were completed in 1909, operates very few trains through and beyond Penn Station. As a result, its two tunnels get far less utilization than they could if a pattern of through metropolitan rail service were developed. The idea of operating trains from New Jersey through Manhattan east to Long Island and north to Connecticut is not a new one, but it is still a good one. Why should the Long Island Rail Road continue to struggle with the obvious inefficiency of dead-end terminal movements in the heart of Manhattan when its service could be made much better and less costly by swinging its trains under the Hudson and terminating their runs at various points on the New Jersey railroads? Consider, also, the advantages that would be gained by extending Grand Central tracks of the New York Central and New Haven through a tunnel connection with through rail operations between Long Island and New Jersey. Such a terminal unification project would finally consummate one of the major unrealized objectives of the Port of New York Authority's comprehensive plan of 1921.

In the Boston area, the sufferings of Suffolk County and the suburbs would be greatly reduced by breaking a tunnel through about a mile and a half of soft slate, putting Boston's North and South stations on the same through tracks. Such a bold stroke would not only break the city's ancient bottlenecks by transforming its two stub-end stations into through stations; it might be the welcome signal for finally getting New England's most important railroads—the New Haven and the Boston and Maine—to work as a winning team. Certainly each road has been finding solo operations a losing proposition.

In the Philadelphia-Camden metropolitan area, it has so far been apparently impossible for the railroads to shake hands across the Delaware River. Not only do the Pennsylvania suburban trains fail to reach the tracks of the Pennsylvania-Reading Seashore lines on the Jersey side of the river, but even on the Philadelphia side there is no coordinated use of tracks and stations by the Pennsylvania Railroad and the Reading Railroad. Each of these lines terminates its suburban runs in a separate stub-end station in downtown Philadelphia. A rail tunnel under Market Street and across the Delaware River would forego an effective through rail network for the City of Brotherly Love and its hinterland.

Chicago, the railroad center of the United States, suffers from its failure to unify tracks of railroads terminating in five obsolete stub-end stations. Chicago's terminal unification problem will never be solved until a coordinated unified-track system is devel-

oped with a series of conveniently located platform stations, so that both suburban and through trains can collect and discharge passengers at more than one station, and so that tracks and facilities can be used for mail, express, and freight trains, as well as passenger trains. Such a unified-rail system could be created on the east side of the central business district by constructing a 3-mile tunnel connecting the Illinois Central south of the Chicago River with the North Western north and west of the river. On the west side of the Loop, a good connection is needed between the North Western's tracks and the Union Station, making Union Station an efficient through station.

In the San Francisco Bay area, one wonders why the Southern Pacific's peninsula line northward from San Jose still gets no farther than the old stub-end station at Third and Townsend Streets, when, by tunneling under the relatively shallow waters of the bay to Oakland, it could become an effective through route for both freight and passenger traffic. Such a cross-bay tunnel would create an efficient San Francisco Bay belt line connecting San Francisco, Oakland, San Jose and the many rapidly growing intermediate communities on either side of the bay.

Even Los Angeles, city of the freeways, is criss-crossed by the rights-of-way of the Southern Pacific, Sante Fe, Union Pacific, and Pacific Electric railways. While the local passenger service of the Pacific Electric has been abandoned, the other railroads still operate through passenger trains into Los Angeles' Union Station (another stub-end facility), and freight service requires the maintenance of many miles of track in the Los Angeles area. Time is running out, but much might still be accomplished if the remaining strategic rail lines of this area were to decide to work as a coordinated metropolitan system.

RAILROAD ELECTRIFICATION

Couple a bolt of lightning to flanged wheels on through metropolitan systems of steel rails and you will have the key to the solution for the metropolitan transportation problem. The nearest thing to a lightning bolt coupled to a railroad is the economical new 25,000-volt a.c. system of railroad electrification, which is now rapidly spreading across Europe and Asia. The 25-kilovolt 50-cycle system, developed by the French National Railways since World War II, has been adopted by the British Transport Commission for an extensive electrification program in the British Isles. Soviet Russia has adopted it for a big new program of electrification. This system has been successfully employed on suburban lines both in Turkey and in Portugal, which is now extending the system northward from Lisbon to Oporto. In Asia, the new system has been adopted for major installations in India and in Communist China and will be utilized in extensions of electrified lines in Japan.

In France, a combination of technical leadership and aggressive promotional efforts has developed a new system which has cut the investment cost of railroad electrification in half while at the same time increasing its efficiency and reliability. By 1961, at least 70 percent of all traffic carried by the 26,000-mile nationalized railroad system will be moved electrically. Tremendous advancement in the speed, capacity, and stamina of conventional electrified railroads, has been scored by the French, while monorail promoters have been attempting to convince the world that the best way to get 100-mile-an-hour trains is to take them off two rails and suspend them from one. Yet, while no commercial monorail has yet been built to carry passengers even as fast as 50 miles an hour, the French have operated trains propelled by modern electric locomotives at 205 miles an hour over a stretch of conventional standard-

gauge track near Bordeaux. Following these successful tests, the French stepped up the speed limit to 100 miles an hour on the Paris-Lyon portion of the famous Mistral run to the Riviera. The Mistral, fastest scheduled train in the world over a long run, now averages 80 miles an hour over the 318 miles between Paris and Lyon.

Rhythmic, trouble-free, high-speed operation 20 hours a day on the Paris-Lyon run has also brought to the French the world's locomotive stamina championship. This was achieved in 1955 by the Alstom electric locomotive CC-7147, which covered a distance of 273,400 miles—more than equal to a trip to the moon—in seven months of regular runs averaging 1,272 miles daily. The locomotive was then given its first general overhaul. Not being satisfied with this record, the French National Railways has since decided on a policy of running a million kilometers—equal to a round trip to the moon—on the Paris-Lyon run before giving the electric locomotives a general overhaul.

Such record-shattering speed and trouble-free performance of modern electrified railroad service are in themselves staggering, but the most spectacular discovery was yet to be revealed. This was the first successful large-scale use of standard high-voltage alternating current for railroad electrification. Less than 10 years of postwar research and experimentation, largely conducted on a 50-mile line near Geneva, led French engineers to embark upon general application of the revolutionary 25-kilovolt 50-cycle single-phase system of rail electrification. The use of such high-voltage alternating current of standard frequency (50-cycle in Europe and 60-cycle in the United States) removes the principal obstacle to railroad electrification—the huge cost of initial installation.

Having built both 1,500-volt direct current lines and 25,000-volt 50-cycle alternating current lines at the same time and under similar conditions, the French were able to demonstrate a saving of approximately 50 percent in the construction cost of the AC system. First, the catenary wire and supporting poles required to feed 25,000-volt alternating current to electric locomotives or self-propelled trains are only about one-third as heavy as those required for the 1,500-volt direct current trolley wire. Second, the 25-kilovolt system does not require a parallel, high-tension transmission line along the right of way, since the trolley wire itself is the high-tension line. This eliminates the complication and cost of three wires and their supporting poles along the right of way—a vast saving in original investment and in maintenance expense. Third, costly substations along the right of way, required to change standard utility current into direct current, or some special low-frequency alternating current, are virtually eliminated. Thus, instead of requiring substations with transformers and rectifiers every 4 to 8 miles, the 25-kilovolt 50-cycle trolley wire needs to be fed only every 30 to 50 miles, where it is connected by transformer with the public-utility power grid.

For metropolitan railway operations, electrification must be regarded as the next important step to be taken after unification of tracks and stations. Under high-density traffic conditions, such as prevail in metropolitan service, electric trains are more efficient and economical than diesel-powered trains. In the long run, using the high-voltage AC system, fuel and maintenance costs will be less for electric than for diesel power. With more traffic concentrated on fewer tracks in a coordinated system, the time will be ripe for a new era of American railroad electrification. By that time, experiments now being made may have perfected a system of automatic train operation by remote control on electrified routes. Louis Armand, former president of the

French National Railways, told me in 1955 that automatic operation of electric trains would in the future be considered just as practical as automatic electric elevators are today. Just last year, installation of a new system of electronic safety devices permitted the Swiss Federal Railways to adopt universal one-man cab control on all trains.

GOOD TRANSPORT IS A DYNAMIC FORCE

Some railroad commuters have been willing to put up with 100 percent fare increases since World War II simply because they would rather pay the increased fares than drive to work. But this does not mean that they are happy with either the fares or the train service. As more and more people have been commuting by automobile, the commuter railroads have been losing passengers, even though commuter revenues are reaching record highs. Under present conditions the automobile gives most commuters faster, more comfortable, and more convenient transportation from door-to-door than public transportation by railroad or transit lines. Furthermore, for those commuters who have access to free or cheap parking at their places of business, the automobile is more economical than railroad commutation. Since the average American family possesses at least one automobile, the fixed costs of car ownership are incurred whether or not the vehicle is used for commutation. Hence, the commuter compares the out-of-pocket cost of driving and parking with the out-of-pocket cost of rail fares plus bus fares to and from the railway stations. Thus many commuters have decided that rail service is too slow, too inconvenient, too uncomfortable, or too expensive for door-to-door transport.

Fortunately, the railroads are not yet out of the race. As fares have been increased, new and comfortable equipment is appearing on some of the roads which seem to believe that their commuter service has a future. How can this change of heart be organized into a vigorous long-range program of spectacular improvements in the quality and economy of rail service?

People will use automobiles only as long as nothing better is available. Trucks will carry most of the freight within and through metropolitan areas only until faster, more efficient, and more economical transport is available. Mail and express will continue to suffer from central terminal delays only until a better system of coordinated metropolitan mail and express distribution is available. Some will say, "Why flay the dying iron horse? His days of service are nearly over." Others will reply that coordinated electrified through metropolitan railway systems may still be made a dynamic force in the new metropolis with beneficial effects upon land utilization and human activities.

We would do well to keep in mind that commercial, social, and recreational developments invariably follow good equipment on good schedules over good routes. The corollary is that transportation improvements can be financed most economically by capitalizing on the future values which transport improvements invariably create. The modern metropolis challenges the railroads, and the future role of the iron horse in urban transport depends upon the response of railroad management to this challenge.

WHO GETS GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, an excellent editorial on Government subsidies appeared in the *Montana Farmer-Stockman* issue of April 15, 1960. This editorial points out in a clear, succinct manner how we are all sharing in Government subsidies daily and that the

matter of Government subsidies—contrary to a popular belief—is not limited to the farmers of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial appearing in the April 15, 1960, Montana Farmer-Stockman, Great Falls, Mont., entitled "Who Gets Government Subsidies?" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO GETS GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES?

Ask the average man on the street what he thinks of Government subsidies and chances are 10 to 1 that he will tell you he is against them, says a recent National Grange bulletin. Ask him who gets most Government subsidies and his answer will be "Farmers." Asked if he or his business receives a subsidy and the answer is likely to be an emphatic, "No."

But despite such commonly expressed opinions, the American public has been supporting an elaborate system of Government subsidies (including tariffs on countless manufactured items), since the first Congress met in 1789. It is difficult to name a business which is not receiving some type of Government subsidy.

This average man on the street, who says he is opposed to all subsidies, comes into contact with them every day.

When he awakens in the morning, he turns on a light and immediately starts sharing the results of a subsidy provided through a fast tax writeoff plan which saves power companies billions of dollars—and which reduces his light bill accordingly.

When he goes to a breakfast of bacon and eggs, he shares the benefits of the Government's \$21 million Federal meat inspection program—a program conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for the sole purpose of assuring the public a safe and wholesome supply of meat.

If he has children in school, their education is subsidized by taxes paid by the childless neighbor across the street. And, if his are among the 12 million children who eat a hot lunch provided through the highly popular Government school lunch program, he receives direct benefits from another \$150 million Government subsidy. If his children are in one of the 78,000 schools participating in the special school milk program, they come in for a share of still another \$75 million subsidy.

When Mr. Average Man-on-the-Street drives the family car into the filling station and tells the attendant to "fill-er-up" he again shares in a major Government subsidy—one brought about through a special depletion allowance tax regulation which cuts the petroleum industry's annual operation expense by about \$1 billion a year.

If he makes a trip by plane, he rides at a fare made possible by a direct subsidy to airlines—and by the tax-supported airports and air traffic control facilities.

If he lives in a house purchased with a GI loan, he pays a lower rate of interest because Uncle Sam has agreed to bail the banker out in case there is a default in payments.

When he sits down to read a magazine, he starts sharing a subsidy provided through the U.S. Post Office Department—a subsidy which has cut the annual cost of mailing a single publication by as much as \$8,604,000. Ready for bed, the average man-on-the-street goes to a closet and places his trousers on a steel hanger that came from a plant built on a cost-plus basis during World War II and sold to a steel company for a song a few years later.

So, throughout the day, the man who says he is opposed to all forms of subsidy

has been sharing special services provided at the taxpayer's expense.

This situation does not justify a continuation of the type of ineffective farm price support programs now in operation, concludes the Grange, but it does show clearly that farmers have not been—and are not now—the exclusive beneficiaries of special subsidies and services supplied at the expense of U.S. taxpayers.

THE BIBLE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Bible is an astonishing miracle. Written fragment by fragment, over the course of many centuries, under different states of society and in different languages, by persons of the most diverse temperaments, talents, and under differing conditions, we can only marvel at the harmony of the whole sublime and momentous work. Its authors were prince and peasant, bond and free. It contains history, prophecy, poetry, proverbs, prayers, and good literature. Its instructive composition gives wisdom to all who seek it, example to all who wish to follow after it, and hope to all who yearn for it. It teaches us how to live and how to die. It never grows old, but is as real and as applicable to the present age as it was to the age in which its divine words were first revealed. Lawyer and merchant, physician and diplomat, statesman and soldier, rich and poor—all may derive from it alike measureless treasures untold. With each reading of it there comes something new. It is an eternal source of strength. Why is it so? Only because it was divinely inspired and it reveals God's wondrous plan of salvation for erring mankind.

Mr. President, may this Nation of ours hold close to itself the beautiful thoughts set forth in Psalm 19, that magnificent tribute to the grandeur of creation and God's law:

The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handywork.

Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge.

There is no speech nor language, where their voice is not heard.

Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world. In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun.

Which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race.

His going forth is from the end of the heaven, and his circuit unto the ends of it; and there is nothing hid from the heat thereof.

The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple.

The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart; the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes.

The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring forever; the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.

More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold; sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb.

Moreover by them is thy servant warned; and in keeping of them there is great reward.

Who can understand his errors? cleanse thou me from secret faults.

Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins; let them not have dominion

over me; then shall I be upright, and I shall be innocent from the great transgression.

Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord, my strength and my redeemer.

NEW YORK SAYS "VIVE DE GAULLE"

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it was my honor and privilege yesterday in New York City to participate in ceremonies and a dinner sponsored by the Franco-American Societies honoring President and Mrs. Charles de Gaulle. The appearance of the French leader in New York City provided many people of my State with an opportunity to express their heartfelt admiration and kinship with him and his nation.

The visit of General de Gaulle to this country has certainly done much to strengthen the traditional bonds of cooperation, friendship, and affection between France and the United States. We are pleased to have had him with us, just as we are glad to have a leader of his stature and resoluteness in the camp of the free nations. His iron will and determination will be vital factors in all efforts to establish a just and lasting peace.

Mr. President, editorials in this morning's New York Herald Tribune and New York Times pay eloquent tribute to the incomparable General de Gaulle and his visit to New York City. I ask unanimous consent to have these editorials printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 27, 1960]

DE GAULLE IN NEW YORK

Twenty-two hours are hardly enough for New York to assess the magnitude of President de Gaulle of France, or for him to savor the friendliness of this city. Yet we think both understood each other perfectly during his visit of yesterday and last night.

On his previous trip in 1944, if we may say so with some little pride in our presence, New York gave the general a rather more cordial welcome than Washington did. He recalls in the second volume of his war memoirs that while his public appearances here were held to a minimum because of political necessities, New York's Mayor La Guardia nevertheless bubbled over in his enthusiasm and friendliness.

Yesterday, too, the city bubbled over with admiration and affection. It is not too much to say that the entente cordiale established between De Gaulle and New York in 1944 was yesterday renewed, revived and made permanent.

Tickertape parades up lower Broadway have become something of a commonplace in recent years. But the sincerity, genuineness and warmth of New York's welcome were unmistakable. And although France's president has been depicted as stern, unbending and austere, it was plain to see that he was touched emotionally by the sight and sound of this great city's outpouring.

For no other Frenchman since the First World War could there have been such a reception, simply because there has been no other Frenchman of like stature. And there are others besides the French who are pleased and proud that grandeur, greatness and leadership in world councils once more come from France.

Wherever he goes in the New World when he leaves New York we believe Charles de Gaulle will be met with similar emotion and enthusiasm. New York is glad that it, in its turn, could give expression to them if only for 22 hours. We do not know if fate will take him this way again. We are proud that he has been here twice, and each time a welcome and cherished visitor.

As he leaves us this morning let it be with the words that rang so often in his ears yesterday: "Vive de Gaulle, Vive la France."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 27, 1960]
DE GAULLE IN NEW YORK

It is impossible for a New Yorker to think of the visit of a great French general to our city without thinking of those memorable days in August 1824, when General Lafayette came ashore in New York on his last visit to the United States. Nothing could be more natural and nothing more apropos, even though we sincerely hope and believe that this is by no means a farewell visit for President Charles de Gaulle.

There were other notable visits, to be sure—Marshal Foch, for instance, on October 28, 1921, and General de Gaulle himself, on July 10, 1944, while the Germans were still in occupation in Paris, and on August 27, 1945, with the war in Europe won and the general already President of the French Provisional Government.

But Lafayette started it on that day long ago when the guns boomed, the West Point band played "See the Conquering Hero Comes," and New York put out its flags and threw flowers while the delirious crowds cheered. Old soldiers wept for joy and for the memories of "battles long ago." The general wept, too.

All this was like a chord whose sound was so true that we will always hear it, as we do now while General de Gaulle is in our city. In Washington, in his address to Congress on Tuesday, the French President himself evoked the memory of that early war when "we fought side by side." We were again fighting as allies when he came here in 1944 and said: "Tomorrow when the world will have to be organized for peace and freedom, the United States of America will find France at her side."

During the next visit, in 1945, victory in Europe having been won, New Yorkers saw another De Gaulle, warm, human, deeply moved by the tribute of the 2 million inhabitants who cheered him. History repeated itself yesterday, when General de Gaulle said he was "profoundly moved." So was Foch in his time. So was Lafayette. So were we and our parents and grandparents all the way back to the day when President John Quincy Adams said farewell to the Marquis de Lafayette in words that were prophetic.

"We shall look upon you always," he said, "as belonging to us, during the whole of our life, and as belonging to our children after us."

LABOR-MANAGEMENT SUMMIT TALKS PLANNED

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the best way for people to get along is to get together.

This is perhaps nowhere more true than in the case of labor-management relations. It is for this reason that I am delighted to call attention this morning to the White House announcement that a series of high level labor-management summit conferences are to be held in the near future.

Although these conferences were organized and initiated by the Federal Government, participation will be limited to three ranking labor leaders and

three top representatives of management. The Federal Government will not plan a role in this conference. This is as it should be.

The subject matter that it is intended will be covered at these several conferences involves a wide range of important issues. To mention a few: Overall labor-management relations, the rate and impact of automation, and the best ways to deal with increased foreign competition. These three subjects are of unlimited scope.

In particular, the matter of automation and the adjustment to automation through the negotiation and promulgation of work rules is, I believe, the most important and fundamental labor-management issue facing America. It has been much in the news of recent date. It is an issue which certainly merits the careful and high level attention of a conference, such as that being organized by the President.

Mr. President, I shall look forward to future developments with regard to these conferences. I know that I voice the opinion of a great majority of my fellow Americans in saying that I earnestly hope the results of these meetings will be fruitful and will promote and insure greater labor-management harmony and cooperation.

SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, since 1933 the U.S. Senate has been strengthened and sustained in its examination of fiscal affairs by a man who brooks no compromise—the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. While others may be tempted to seek an easy way out or to juggle facts and figures, the distinguished and dedicated Senator from Virginia abides by one simple, old-fashioned rule, which is nonetheless applicable in 1960 for all its antiquity, the rule that taxes must equal expenditures.

In the March issue of Dun's Review, Mr. Paul Wooten underscores in a few hundred words the integrity and value of the efforts of the deceptively quiet Senator from Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest that, although his voice is often pitched low, it carries far and clear into the minds of many of his colleagues and fellow Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from Dun's Review be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WARNING FROM SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD:
"FEDERAL SPENDING MUST BE CURBED"

Like Belshazzar, Senator HARRY F. BYRD sees the handwriting on the wall. The ominous warning which concerns the southern conservative is this country's trillion-dollar public and private indebtedness.

"It is well to learn caution from the experience of others," says the Virginia Democrat. "In our time, we have witnessed the devastating experience of Germany, France, and other nations as a result of their departure from sound financial policies. A welfare state is a subterfuge for good government. It has brought to grief every nation in all history that has tried it."

"Preservation of fiscal soundness is not easy," BYRD concedes, "but the present situation cries out for the elimination of every postponable expenditure so that a substantial start can be made toward reducing the national debt. Such a course would be followed if it became apparent that it is the wish of the people. Business and professional men have a heavy responsibility in that connection. They are leaders in their communities and should be able to arouse the citizens to assert their influence. Congress will be quick to cut appropriations if it becomes apparent that the people want it done."

It was BYRD who sponsored the legislation that gave increased flexibility in the management of the public debt. It was this bill which postponed, for tax purposes, the recognition of capital gains and losses on the exchange of outstanding Treasury securities for new issues. Such advance refunding creates a minimum of market disturbance. It is recognized as an effective way of extending the maturity of the debt.

Some of the legislators who have been complaining loudest about high interest rates, BYRD points out, fail to mention that Congress is the principal offender. Had Congress removed the 4¼ percent ceiling on the interest rate for long-term bonds, Senator BYRD says, the Government would not have been forced to do its borrowing on a short-term basis. In forcing the Treasury to do its refunding in the short-term market, he believes, a great disservice was done small business and those who need short-term money.

Senator BYRD, who is chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, has long been a crusader for reduced Federal expenditures and for the more economical use of appropriations. He feels that the country has been more generous to veterans than it can afford, and he looks with concern on the progressive liberalization of social security. Foreign aid expenditures particularly arouse the Senator's ire.

"Through the fiscal year to end June 30, the United States will have spent \$73 billion in foreign aid since the end of World War II. That does not include the cost of the Korean war. It does not include our military expenditures abroad or our expenditures for NATO and other organizations for protection of the free world. All of this foreign aid expenditure has been added to the public debt for future generations to pay."

To date, the Senator points out, most of our so-called foreign aid has gone to what may generally be regarded as developed nations. The emphasis is now being shifted to underdeveloped and less-developed nations. These nations in the free world contain more than a billion people, and their needs for money are unlimited.

"Obviously, there is a limit beyond which the American taxpayer cannot be taken," Senator BYRD declares. "There are already areas where taxation is reaching the point of diminishing returns. Our Federal debt is nearly \$300 billion.

"Our balance of payments with foreign countries has been in serious decline. Our gold reserves have been dwindling. If the strength and integrity of the American dollar is not maintained, we shall not meet our commitments at home or abroad."

GROWTH AND TAXES

The present level of taxation is a menace to the economic growth of the United States, BYRD warns.

"It would help ease our balance of payments difficulties if our prices were competitive with those of producers abroad. Our purchases abroad, foreign investments, and aid are some \$20 billion more than we have earned overseas through export of goods and services. A fourth of our merchandise exports are agricultural products. One-third

of those exports are being paid for in soft currencies. Many of our products have been priced out of foreign trade. Confidence in the American dollar must be maintained."

The Government must, BYRD insists, stop nonessential and postponable spending, cease profligate spending which has strained our financial position, reduce the debt, and lighten the burden being piled on the next generation if we are to protect the fundamentals on which our form of government and our enterprise system are founded.

OPPOSITION TO FLYING OF PANAMANIAN FLAG OVER CANAL ZONE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a firm policy is needed in Panama regarding demands by nationalists in that Republic for transfer of the sovereignty of the Canal Zone from the United States to Panama. Accordingly, on February 16 I introduced S. Res. 275, declaring it to be the sense of the Senate that the Panamanian Government should not be allowed to fly its flag over the Canal Zone, and that inasmuch as the sovereignty of the Canal Zone had been transferred in perpetuity to the United States by virtue of solemn treaty, there should be no surrender of that sovereignty except with the advice and consent of the Senate through a treaty of equal dignity.

I must emphasize that to a Panamanian, as to any American, the flag is a symbol of the highest and most sacred significance, and that to allow the Panamanian flag to fly over the Canal Zone would not be idle gesture, as has been suggested by some experts, but would be interpreted by the Panamanians as confirmation on the part of the American Government of Panamanian claims to the Canal Zone.

Mr. President, my resolution was duly referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, where it is presently awaiting action. And action is needed. On May 8 presidential elections will be held in the Republic of Panama and the candidates for that country's highest office are filling the air with revelations and rhetoric. These worthy gentlemen are talking of Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone and of the possible nationalization of that great international seaway. Mr. President, we should set these gentlemen straight immediately about the Canal Zone.

I have pressed the Foreign Relations Committee for action on my resolution before the Panamanian presidential elections of May 8. A recent article in the Star and Herald of Panama on page 1 indicates the concern of the thousands of American citizens in the Canal Zone in this matter. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed into the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Star and Herald, Apr. 8, 1960]
SENATOR BUTLER ASKS ACTION TO BAN REPUBLIC OF PANAMA FLAG ON CANAL ZONE—URGES VOTE BEFORE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA ELECTIONS—SENATOR CLAIMS DELAY WOULD CREATE FALSE HOPES IN PANAMA

WASHINGTON, April 7.—Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER said today the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been asked to act

on his resolution to prohibit the flying of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone.

In a letter to Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Butler said he introduced the resolution February 16 and that action is imperative before the Panamanian presidential election on May 8.

"I believe," said BUTLER, "that if Senate action is delayed until after the elections, the promises of Panamanian politicians will raise cruelly false hopes in the people of Panama that their flag will be permitted to fly over the zone."

BUTLER said he introduced the resolution following a statement by Panamanian President Ernesto de la Guardia, Jr. that "the placing of our flag there (in the Canal Zone) is only a logical end of ratifying Panamanian sovereignty."

"I feel," said BUTLER, "that the Canal Zone is sovereign territory of the United States, acquired by constitutional means. I further feel that to permit the Republic of Panama to fly its flag over the Canal Zone would be an unconstitutional encroachment upon our sovereignty."

BUTLER's resolution would declare it to be the sense of the U.S. Senate that there shall be no executive surrender of the U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone either by permitting the flying of the Panamanian flag over the zone or otherwise. It says that since the sovereignty of the United States over the Canal Zone was created by treaty there should be no surrender of that sovereignty without treaty of equal dignity.

"I believe that if Senate action is delayed until after the elections the promises of the Panamanian politicians will raise cruelly false hopes in the people of Panama that their flag will be permitted to fly over the zone," BUTLER wrote FULBRIGHT.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the hour of 2 o'clock arrives, the pending business be continued as the pending business at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment is open to amendment.

Mr. COOPER obtained the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator from Kentucky to yield, to enable me to make a brief statement on the bill?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I reported favorably the bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, which is now before the Senate for action. I shall discuss the bill briefly, so that Senators may be familiar with its provisions. However, I understand that the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky desires to offer an

amendment for himself and several other Senators, and that it would be more convenient for him if he were permitted to offer the amendment at this point. I am, therefore, happy to yield to him now, but I shall make a fuller explanation of the bill after the Senator from Kentucky has completed his remarks.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "2-8-60-A," offered on February 8 of this year for myself, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 3, it is proposed to delete the word "may" and insert in lieu thereof the word "shall."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, would the Senator from Kentucky, for the purpose of the RECORD, be willing to make a brief statement as to why he considers his amendment desirable?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, S. 743 as reported by the committee removes the exemption now accorded to title I mines, the so-called small mines, which employ 14 or less persons, and places those mines under the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board for the purpose of Federal inspection and for all other purposes under the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, as amended in 1952, except as other amendments are provided in S. 743.

Paragraph (b) (1) of the committee amendment provides:

The Director may, by regulation established after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to interested parties, modify or make inapplicable any provisions, or part thereof, of section 209 to any mine or class of mines when he finds that such provision or part thereof does not substantially contribute to the safety of the men working in such mines covered by such regulations.

The amendment would substitute "shall" for "may," thus making it mandatory upon the Director to hold hearings and to make such modifications of section 209 as he finds are applicable to title I mines, particularly if the regulations now provided under section 209 do not contribute to the safety of men working in the small mines.

The debate we had for 2 years in the committee was upon the issue as to whether the regulations now contained in section 209 were actually applicable to smaller mines, from the standpoint of contributing to the safety of the employees of the mines.

The amendment I offer for myself and my colleagues directs the Director to conduct hearings and to make changes in section 209, to apply to title I mines only those provisions, and no more, that are actually required for mines safety. He certainly must look into the question of whether or not the regulations pro-

vided under section 209 would be so burdensome as to close down small mines without adding to their safety.

I sincerely hope that the Senator from Pennsylvania, who was the chairman of the subcommittee which conducted the hearings—which he did in a very fair, comprehensive way, will consent to accept the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I desire to commend the Senator from Pennsylvania for his efforts in the general field of improving the safety which will attend the miners in their work in the coal mines. I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky will be accepted. I believe the combination of the provisions contained in the bill presented by the Senator from Pennsylvania and those in the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky will, generally, achieve the principal objective sought. On the whole, I believe the bill as amended will promote the development of the coal mining industry and, in a maximum degree, will insure the safety of the miners who work in the coalpits.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Ohio for their kind words.

The amendment which has just been offered by the Senator from Kentucky for himself and three other Senators is the result of a number of discussions and conferences in which we who are interested in the bill have been engaged for a period of more than a year.

Speaking for myself, I am quite sympathetic with the problems raised by the bill as originally drafted for the operators of the smaller mines, those which employ 14 or fewer individuals. They are very much concerned that the Federal coal mine safety requirements which will now be extended to them on a mandatory basis will deprive them of their livelihood, and will be enforced against them in perhaps a discriminatory manner. I do not share that concern, which I believe to be without too much foundation.

On the other hand, it is very clear that many small mines, as we call them, which employ 14 or fewer individuals, are family enterprises, where the normal relationships between employer and employee and the State, in terms of health and safety, do not apply. After talking with a number of Senators who are members of the committee, and with others who are desirous, through their sponsorship, to have the bill enacted, I am authorized to accept, and I am happy to accept, the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Kentucky, the senior and junior Senators from Virginia, and the junior Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for a moment?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

CVI—549

Mr. COOPER. I intend to speak later on the bill, but now that the Senator from Pennsylvania is about to begin his explanation of the bill, I wish to make this statement.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare considered S. 743 and S. 3290, an identical bill, during the 2 years 1958 and 1959. It spent a great deal of time discussing every aspect of the bill. All of us were concerned about the safety of the men who work in the mines. Anyone who lives in a coal mining State, who has ever been in the coal mining business, or who has worked in a mine, knows that mining is a perilous occupation, but also one of the most necessary and useful for our country.

The distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania in his capacity as chairman of the subcommittee conducted thorough hearings. Although I was not a member of the subcommittee, I attended the hearings. I found the Senator from Pennsylvania to be absolutely fair and objective in his approach to the bill, and his willingness to consider amendments to protect the small mines even though he was a sponsor of the bill which was introduced.

I make the same statement about the other members of the committee, one of whom I see on the floor at this time; I refer to the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who worked hard and with fairness in the bill. I do not remember any instance in my service on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in which more thorough consideration was given to a bill. The distinguished chairman, Senator HILL, and other members also worked very hard to report a fair bill. One of them was the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is a fine lawyer, and one who is always concerned with due process; and I could name the other Members.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. President, let me point out that the Senator from Kentucky has made a real contribution in the form of the bill as it comes to the floor of the Senate. As a result of his interest in the small-mine workers of his State, the bill has been drastically rewritten; and I think it is now fairer and better than the bill I originally introduced with the cosponsorship of several of my colleagues. A great deal of the credit for the improvement of the bill is due to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. He did very fine work in that connection, and we were most happy to have him sit with the subcommittee. He made a very real contribution to the final product.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President—

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is appropriate at this point—even though later I shall address myself to the subject matter of the proposed legislation—to join with my esteemed colleague, the Senator from Pennsylvania, in paying genuine tribute to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] for the objectivity with which he approached this assignment, which was given him—as he has indicated—not as a member of the

subcommittee, but as a spokesman for a considerable number of groups and individuals in reference to the proposed legislation now under consideration here.

Although, at the outset, we had perhaps deeper differences than we might have had, the hearings were conducive to a better understanding of the problem of providing for the safety of the coal miners of the United States who bring from the earth the coal which is so beneficial to our expanding economy.

So, Mr. President, not to labor the point, but because I wish to join the Senator from Pennsylvania in his sincere remarks, I would say that, by and large, what was done by the subcommittee was constructive, even though we had our different points of approach.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. President, I should like to turn to a relatively brief explanation of the provisions of the bill.

This bill is a successor of one which was introduced last year by the Senator from Montana, Mr. Murray, the Senator from Colorado, Mr. Carroll, the Senator from Utah, Mr. Moss, the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. McGee, the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. Randolph, the Senator from Indiana, Mr. Hartke, the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. Scott, the late Senator Langer, of North Dakota, the Senator from Alaska, Mr. Gruening, the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. O'Mahoney, the Senator from Illinois, Mr. Douglas, and myself.

The purpose of the bill, as originally introduced, was to extend the coverage of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act of 1952 to small mines which employ 14 or fewer persons. As originally introduced, the bill was only 3 lines long; it merely struck out the exemption, in subsection (b) of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, for mines employing 14 or fewer persons.

Rather extensive hearings were held; there are 258 printed pages of them. Copies of them are available to all Senators.

As a result of the hearings, the bill was rewritten into its present form.

When the Coal Mine Safety Act was passed, 8 years ago, there was opposition by many operators, of mines both large and small, who contended that the enactment of such a safety law would work an economic hardship on them. That led to a compromise under which small mines employing 14 or fewer persons were exempted from the provisions of the Federal law.

I should point out that during the period since World War II, the economics of the coal industry have shifted rather substantially. The larger mines have been mechanized. Their production has been increased. The number of persons employed in them has been drastically reduced; and the products of these larger mines are in substantial competition across the country with the products of the small mines which, under the terms of the 1952 act, were exempted from Federal safety requirements.

The provision exempting mines employing 14 or fewer men from the coverage of the 1952 Safety Act is a purely arbitrary one. As the Director of the

Bureau of Mines, Marling J. Ankeny, stated in his testimony before the subcommittee:

There is no logic to it (the 14-man limit) whatever. It was a matter of compromise.

Since the 1952 act went into effect, both the number of fatalities and the fatality rate per man-hour of exposure in the large mines covered by its provisions have fallen markedly, although the number of fatalities and the fatality rate in the small mines have remained approximately the same.

Bureau of Mines statistics indicate that in recent years the fatality rate in small mines has been more than double the fatality rate in the large mines covered by the Federal law.

There are known to exist in title I mines serious safety violations which State safety laws have not succeeded in eliminating.

I now quote from the testimony which Director Ankeny gave before the committee:

According to the records of the Bureau of Mines for 1958, 13,869 violations of the mandatory provisions of the act were observed in 5,484 title I (employing 14 or less) mines. This means that during this year there were on the average about 2.5 such violations reported on each title I mine.

Mr. President, no one contends that the enactment of this bill will automatically reduce the fatality rate per man-hour of exposure in small mines to the rate prevailing for the larger mines which now are covered by the Federal law. However, it is the contention of the sponsors of Senate bill 743 that the enactment of the bill will inevitably improve the safety conditions under which those who work in the small mines have to labor.

Again I quote from the testimony which Mr. Ankeny gave when he summarized his support of Senate bill 743:

I support S. 743 because title I mines, as indicated by our inspection of them, contain disaster hazards which will in a number of instances lead to both major disaster and disaster-type accidents, and the passage of S. 743 would enable Federal inspectors to at least reduce the number of these hazards in the small mine, in the title I mine.

Mr. President, the committee amendments provide certain procedural aids and safeguards for those who operate small mines so as to assure that the economic impact on them from the enactment of the bill will be minimal.

First, the Director of the Bureau of Mines would be authorized to issue regulations modifying or making inapplicable any provision of section 209 of the original act, the section which recites the detailed requirements, whenever the Director of the Bureau of Mines finds that such provision does not substantially contribute to the safety of the men working in small mines.

I interject here to say that the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky, which has just been accepted on behalf of the committee, would make it mandatory for the Director to establish, after notice and hearings to interested parties, rules and regulations which would modify or make inapplicable any part of the requirements set forth in sec-

tion 209 when he finds that such provisions do not substantially contribute to the safety of the men working in the mines. In other words, we have made action by the Director mandatory, instead of permissive.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. First, I wish to congratulate the able senior Senator from Pennsylvania upon the presentation of the bill and upon the address he has made with respect to it. It is a notable achievement, of which he has every right to be proud. I, too, am proud of it for him.

Perhaps I am the only Member of the Senate who has actually administered mine inspection and mine safety programs on the State level. Before coming to the Congress it was my privilege to serve as Commissioner of Labor of the State of Tennessee. The mining inspection and safety program, workmen's compensation, and other programs relating to the mining system, are administered in Tennessee by the Labor Department. From my experience, I can bear witness that inspection, with adequate technical equipment for inspection, can result in the saving of lives and the prevention of accidents. Unfortunately, all States do not at all times give adequate enforcement to their own mine inspection laws and programs.

As I understand the Senator's bill, no requirement would be necessary except that which does promote the safety of mine operations. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. I should like to thank him for his kind words. I appreciate his joining in this debate. I know that his experience will be very helpful to our colleagues when we come to vote on the bill.

Mr. GORE. I shall join in support of the bill, and whatever assistance I can render, either in debate or in personal conversation, will be rendered with pleasure.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for his helpful comments.

Mr. President, I turn now to the second amendment which was made by the committee to the original bill to safeguard the interests of small mine operators. This second change would permit the small mine operators to appeal to the Bureau of Mines or to the Coal Mine Safety Board of Review from the finding by a Federal inspector of a violation. The operators would not have to wait until a closing order had been issued against the mine, as is now the case when safety infractions occur in large mines.

Mr. President, this amendment to the act results from the fear expressed by a number of operators of smaller mines that the Federal inspection system would be used arbitrarily against them; that an order would be issued closing down their mines for various technical violations of the law, and they would not have an adequate opportunity to appeal and have that appeal determined until many days, perhaps months, after a mine had been closed and customers of the mine had been diverted to other sources for obtaining their coal.

The subcommittee was convinced that this right of prompt appeal was a wise additional measure and that the appeal could be conducted without jeopardizing the safety of the men working in the mine.

The third amendment which the committee made to the original bill would require the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review to hear appeals by small mine operators at the county seat of the county in which the mine in question was located or at any other place reasonably convenient to the operator of the mine.

This amendment results also from a fear on the part of the small mine operator that he would be dragged, on short notice, to Washington where he would have to defend the continued operation of his mine in a strange arena, far from the locality where the mine was being operated, and at substantial expense to him.

Recognizing that many of these small mine operators have limited financial resources, and believing further that it would be wise to have the hearing of the appeal in the community in which the mine was being operated, the committee accepted the suggestion which was proposed by the Senator from Kentucky and other Senators; and it will now be necessary for the appellate tribunal to come into an area reasonably convenient to the location of the mine, and convenient to the operator of the mine, to hear the appeal.

The fourth change made in the bill, as reported, would prevent Federal inspectors from closing a mine employing seven or fewer employees for a violation of section 209 of the present act unless the Federal inspector's finding is concurred in by a State inspector or by an independent inspector appointed by a Federal district court of the district in which the mine is located.

It will be difficult for Members of the Senate who do not come from States where coal mining is a major industry to appreciate the need for this provision, yet all of us on the committee were convinced it was a wise addition to the bill. Mines are being operated in practically all the coal-producing States on a family basis. The head of the family and perhaps a brother, or brother-in-law, or a son, or a father, or some of the cousins, will go up on the hill back of the house in which the family lives, drive a tunnel into the side of the hill, strike a vein of coal close to the surface, and operate this as a coal mine. Technically, it is a coal mine. Actually, it is an informal family operation which is very far removed, indeed, from the highly mechanized, intensely organized operation of deep shaft coal mines by large corporations.

Many of these small businessmen were concerned, again, that the great Federal bureaucracy would come to the mines—without any real understanding of the human, family, and business problems—and would issue regulations closing the little enterprises on the hills behind the houses, applying the same stringent requirements to such little tunnels as the Federal bureaucracy would apply to a large coal mine op-

erated by one of the big corporations of the country.

Therefore, quite wisely, I think, the operators of these small family enterprises were given the protection of being able to call in, to redress the balance, a State inspector, who would be more familiar with the social and economic conditions in the vicinity, and perhaps somewhat more sympathetic than someone from a Federal bureau with respect to the problems with which the operator of such a mine would have to deal.

It was also provided that if it were impossible, under the circumstances in the State, to obtain a State inspector, an independent inspector could be appointed by a Federal district court in the district in which the mine was located, so as to assure that a wholly impartial arbitrator would hear the controversy between the Federal mine inspector and the operator before the little family business or small business was driven to the wall by what some feared would be an unduly harsh finding by a Federal inspector.

Mr. President, these are the major changes which were made by the committee in the original bill. Every one of them was put into the bill in an effort to be scrupulously fair to the operators of the smaller mines. No one of them, I think, would cripple or would in any way impinge upon the safety provisions of the bill. Each one of them, on the other hand, I think, does provide for safeguards to protect American small business. I hope the Senate will look with favor on the provisions contained in the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am appreciative that the diligent senior Senator from Pennsylvania yields to me so that I may make an observation.

In connection with the administration of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, I believe I am correct in stating that there was no evidence, during our subcommittee hearings, that the administration of the act had been other than satisfactory. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is quite correct. The fears of those individuals who entertained fears were all anticipatory, and, to my way of thinking, in many respects were quite unjustified; yet I think the committee wanted to be sure it was being fair.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I share the expressions of the Senator from Pennsylvania with reference to the reasoning by the members of the subcommittee and of the committee in accepting the proposed changes, which the Senator has interpreted so well for the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. President, I have two brief additional points to make, and then I shall be happy to yield the floor, in order that my colleagues may speak with respect to the bill.

The additional cost of the Federal inspection provided for in the bill will be \$400,000 a year. This is a pretty modest

amount, but in view of the rather critical position which the administration has taken toward the expenditure of as much as 1 cent more in the current budget, I am sure my friends on the other side of the aisle and some of my friends on this side of the aisle will be happy to know that the administration has approved this bill and supports it, despite the fact that it calls for the expenditure of this additional sum of \$400,000 to properly enforce the increased responsibility to be given by the act.

Finally, Mr. President, I should like to say a word through the RECORD to my good constituents, the operators of the smaller mines in Pennsylvania. They have been seriously concerned by the present effort to amend the act. They have felt this was an effort by the larger coal mines and, to be perfectly frank, by the United Mine Workers of America, to put the smaller and nonunion mines out of business. They came to Washington, D.C., and testified. They wrote me many letters. I have spent a good deal of time in conversation with these worried constituents of mine.

I should like to assure my constituents that not only I but also my Republican colleague [Mr. SCOTT] and the members of the subcommittee and of the full committee have given very careful attention to the objections they raised. The provisions of the bill, which I have recited at some length, are a reflection of our concern that they should be permitted to continue in business, and to continue in business at a profit, without interference from the large coal mines or the men who work in the large coal mines, so long as they maintain proper safety provisions.

The need for those proper safety provisions is perhaps well evidenced by the unhappy tragedies which occurred in Maryland and Kentucky, earlier this month. Three men were killed in a small mine cave-in near Kitzmiller, Md., just a few days ago; and three men were killed at almost the same time in an unfortunate mine fatality due to a roof fall in a small mine near Houckville, Lawrence County, Ky. In both cases only three men were employed in the mines, so all miners working in both mines were killed. The deceased were all miners of many years' experience.

One can hope that had the pending bill been enacted into law and had timely Federal mine safety inspections been made these unhappy tragedies would not have occurred.

The State inspectors had not been able to inspect and to require the proper precautions to be taken. I suggest that this kind of tragedy, which is occurring every month because appropriate legislation has not been enacted into law, may well be prevented if the Senate will, this afternoon, pass and send to the House for final action the bill which is now pending.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania for serving

as the chief sponsor of the pending bill. I was very happy to join him as a cosponsor.

As the Senator may remember, two terrible coal mine accidents in the State of Illinois helped to lay the basis for the 1952 act, namely, the disaster at Centralia in 1948, and the disaster at West Frankfort in 1951. Those two accidents helped to trigger the 1952 act, which applied to mines employing more than 14 persons. With respect to such mines, I think the record has been a very good one. Power is given to the Federal coal mine inspectors to close a mine if it is markedly unsafe.

However, a large percentage of accidents occur in mines with fewer than 14 employees. If a man is killed, it does not make much difference whether he is killed in a small mine or a large mine.

Mr. CLARK. It is much the same to him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

I notice, in the revised and amended text of the bill, and in the report of the committee, that every effort has been made to protect the operators of small mines. As I understand it, it is provided that for mines which employ fewer than 14 miners, there is a possibility of appeal.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The appeal to be heard at the county seat where the mine is located, so that operators and miners will not have to travel great distances.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it furthermore true that in the case of the extremely small mines the Federal mine inspector may not close a mine unless his decision is concurred in by the State mine inspector?

Mr. CLARK. Or by an independent inspector appointed by the judge of the Federal court of the district in which the mine is located. The provision referred to applies to violators of section 209 of the act.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So that every effort has been made to protect the operators of small mines against unreasonable action by the Federal mine inspectors.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. At the same time, an effort is made to protect the lives and the safety of the coal miners who work in such mines.

Mr. CLARK. That is the purpose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania and the other members of the committee for reporting the bill. I hope it will be passed unanimously.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for his helpful comments. I am happy that he has associated himself as a cosponsor of the pending legislation.

Mr. President, unless other Senators desire to question me, I yield the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I feel gratified that the distinguished author of the bill was willing to accept the amendment offered by our colleague from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] in behalf of the two Kentucky Senators and the two Senators from Virginia. We feel that that measurably improves the bill; but, unfortunately, I still cannot bring myself to support it.

I am opposed to the pending bill, S. 743, because I feel it would threaten the continuation of several thousand small business operations and add to an already acute unemployment problem in coal mining areas without serving the practical ends of safety.

The Executive Office of the President and the Department of the Interior both have indicated willingness to accept as a substitute for this bill S. 2403, which would authorize a thorough study of mine safety problems and the best way of dealing with them. I hope that the Senate will follow that course and permit further investigations before we extend Federal power to another area of small business and take away the authority which now is exercised by State agencies responsible for safety measures in mines employing not more than 14 persons.

It is significant, I believe, that I have not received a single communication from an employee of a small coal mine endorsing S. 743 as a measure which would benefit him. On the other hand, I have received dozens of letters from operators of these small mines who say passage of this bill will threaten their business existence and who charge that this legislation, regardless of the fine motives of its sponsors, will serve only to put them out of business because they cannot afford to buy the type of safety equipment that would be required and needed only in deep shaft or gassy mines.

I think it is significant, also, that Members of this body from the States—Virginia and Kentucky—in which a majority of the small mines are located are opposing S. 743 and that it is being sponsored by representatives of States where most of the coal mining operations are on a large scale and would not be directly affected by this legislation.

The Governor of Virginia and the officials in my State who are responsible for mine safety not only see no need for such a law as S. 743 would provide, but they also resent the implication that Virginia will not take adequate precautions to protect its mineworkers and they are opposed to this intervention by Federal authorities.

Organizations of businessmen in the mining areas of my State, who are deeply concerned about the welfare of local residents, see no benefit to miners in this legislation, but have expressed their fear of its economic effects.

It should be recognized that in many small mining operations there is not the dividing line between labor and management which exists in larger enterprises. The owner of the mine and members of his family are likely to be active workers in the operation. They are exposed to the same dangers as the few outside workers they employ. If they neglect proper safety precautions, they risk their own lives. It is these men who have told me they see no virtue but much danger in S. 743.

They would not mind any regulations which were needed and especially adapted to their type of operation and they would welcome the type of study proposed in S. 2403, especially if it led to educational efforts that would pro-

mote safety. But they say it is as inappropriate to saddle the little mines with the same type of regulation now applied to the big mines as it would be to impose on owners of motorboats all the safety restrictions applied to ocean liners.

The Federal Coal Mine Safety Act of 1952, which S. 743 would broaden to cover mines employing less than 15 persons, did not attempt to deal with day-to-day types of minor accidents, which were left for State regulation. This was positively stated in a letter dated July 18, 1958, signed by Assistant Secretary of the Interior Royce A. Hardy, who said:

Congress reserved to the jurisdiction of the States the responsibility for control of the day-to-day type of accidents.

This letter quoted House Report 2368 of the 82d Congress, 2d session, dated June 30, 1952, as saying the bill passed that year "is designed to prevent the causes of these major disasters," and Mr. Hardy added:

The proposed legislation (similar to S. 743) is also designed to prevent these causes and extends coverage to mines employing less than 15 men.

And yet, at the time that letter was written there had been in all the years for which the Bureau of Mines has records, only two disaster-type accidents involving the small mines. Since then there has been a third accident involving nine persons. But, with these exceptions, most of the small mine accidents have been of the type which Federal legislation never was designed to cover.

I know that statistics have been inserted in the RECORD of this body listing the number of accidents occurring in small and in large mines and purporting to show the need for this legislation. Those figures are challenged, however, by the small mine operators as being of doubtful accuracy and in any case highly misleading.

The figures which have been submitted for the record are presented as "subject to revising." That phrase might be accepted as meaning merely that final figures would require a slight adjustment but previous experience has shown that where this particular type of statistic is concerned, "revising" may be a major operation. They are estimates, rather than preliminary and not quite complete reports and what may happen to them is illustrated by the fact that in March 1958 the Bureau of Mines released statistics purporting to show a fatality rate in class I—small—mines of 4.24 per million man-hours during the year 1957; in April 1958 the Bureau revised its figures to show this 1957 rate was 3.23 and in January 1959 it issued another revision, bringing the 1957 rate down to 2.55.

Information obtained from State authorities in Virginia and Kentucky has shown that the Federal agency seriously underestimated the number of men employed in small mines in those States and it may be presumed that figures from other States are equally inaccurate. Of course, the understatement of production figures results in a higher

apparent accident rate when the calculation is made by comparing the number of accidents with the number of tons produced.

Also, in these statistics the accident rate attributed to the smaller mines is exaggerated because the larger, mechanized mines produce more coal per worker and, therefore, the per capita exposure in relation to the amount of coal mined is less.

A fairer comparison would be based on the number of accidents compared to the number of man-hours worked, but even these figures would be unreliable unless the reporting agency had full information—which the Federal Bureau of Mines obviously does not have—on the number of men employed in the small mines.

The difference which a change in the basis of statistics from production to man-hours might make is illustrated by the fact that in Virginia class II—large—mines produce about 60 percent of the coal, but class I—small—mines employ about 60 percent of the workers to produce the remaining 40 percent.

Even if accident figures applied to class I mines are accepted at face value, however, the proponents of S. 743 will have difficulty showing that its passage would improve the situation, in view of the fact that the accident rate in large mines, which have been subject to this type of regulation since 1952, has been increasing rather than declining.

Evidently there is need for further study of means to prevent accidents in large mining operations and until that has been done and until more accurate data has been obtained on small mine operations, there is no justification for putting these small mines under Federal supervision.

I hope, therefore, that S. 743 will be rejected.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOIL CONSERVATION ACT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, 25 years ago today the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, signed into law the first soil conservation act in the history of our country.

The act, which received the unanimous approval of the Congress, declared soil and water conservation on farm, grazing, and forest lands of the Nation to be a permanent policy of the Congress of the United States.

It also created the Soil Conservation Service in the Department of Agriculture to exercise the powers conferred by the law.

Today I wish to pay tribute to the Soil Conservation Service for the admirable job it has done during the first quarter-century of its existence. More progress has been made in advancing soil and water conservation on the farmlands of America during the past 25 years than in all the previous years of our existence.

One of the most formidable obstacles that faced the dedicated employees of the Soil Conservation Service was the need to change the attitude of millions

of people about the need for conserving our land and water resources.

All through the history of our young Nation, we have been blessed with an almost unlimited supply of land and water. But today, faced with the prospect of an ever-growing population, we must realize that there is a limit to the bountiful gifts that nature has given us. We must look to the future.

The Soil Conservation Service has done a splendid job in this direction. It has convinced thousands of farmers of the benefits of conserving our soil and water resources and has followed through in assisting them in getting on with the job.

Of the many factors which have contributed to this success, three are outstanding:

First was the development of the concept of using a scientific inventory of the soil on each farm to determine its capability for safe use. This has made it possible for farmers to prepare and apply, with technical help, practical conservation plans for their land—plans which are scientifically sound.

Second was the development by the Soil Conservation Service of a new kind of professional technician—the soil conservationist. This has made it possible to bring to coordinated focus on a single farm, techniques representing a combination of the physical, biological, and social science.

Third was the creation of local soil conservation districts through which the services of the Soil Conservation Service are made available to farmers. This has made it possible to bring the full benefits of modern conservation technology to individual farms under local control and guidance according to local needs and desires.

The growth of the soil conservation district movement in the United States is one of the phenomenal developments of the past quarter century.

The use of soil conservation districts was originally conceived as a mechanism whereby Federal assistance could be made available to farmers through a unit of State government. This thought was nurtured and fostered. In 1937 a model State soil conservation district law was transmitted to the Governors of all States by the President, urging that such laws, adapted to local conditions, be enacted.

In the short span of time that has since elapsed, every State legislature has enacted such a law. Some 2,865 soil conservation districts have been organized by local people under these laws. They include within their boundaries some 95 percent of all the farms and ranches in this Nation. Nearly 2 million farmers are now cooperating with local soil conservation districts in practicing conservation farming.

Each soil conservation district has a program for solving the soil and water conservation problems within its boundaries. In addition to the help of the Federal Government, all State legislatures are now appropriating State funds to help the districts carry out their programs. Some county governments are providing needed resources and many

private organizations and individuals are making contributions.

Today the soil conservation district is the central source of help and information about soil and water conservation in nearly every community in the Nation.

Some 14,000 private citizens are providing the local leadership for the functioning of these districts. I would venture a guess that since the inception of this program more than 50,000 persons have served their fellow citizens in this leadership capacity.

In my judgment, this represents the most successful experiment in agricultural democracy in the history of the United States.

But what of the future? Much work remains to be done if we are to adequately preserve our most precious natural resources—soil and water—so that they can be of benefit to our grandchildren, and to their grandchildren.

I have every reason in the world to believe that the hard-working people who give so freely of their time and energy to provide leadership in the soil conservation district movement will continue to do so in the future.

For what they have done in the past, and for what they will do in the future, they deserve our tribute, and the everlasting gratitude of millions of American citizens as yet unborn—the people who will eventually profit from their fine work.

On this occasion of the 25th anniversary of the Soil Conservation Service, it is appropriate that we publicly commend the work which has been done by the corps of soil and water conservation technicians in the Soil Conservation Service.

Therefore, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I would like to say "well done" to the men and women of the soil conservation districts, and my sincere hope that they will continue their efforts to insure the economic welfare of our Nation in the years to come.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am very glad that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has made his statement on the Soil Conservation Act, and its great success in the years which have passed since its inauguration, and also his word of appreciation for the many soil conservation districts throughout the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to pay tribute to the farmers and ranchers of America and to the Soil Conservation Service for 25 years of notable accomplishments in soil and water conservation.

Our national soil and water conservation program began in 1935—on April 27—when we of the 74th Congress enacted Public Law No. 46, an act that declared soil and water conservation to be a permanent national policy and established the Soil Conservation Service.

It was my privilege to be a part of this development from the very beginning. I came to the Senate on January 3, 1935, when the 1st session of the 74th Congress began, having been elected by the people of the great State of Mon-

tana November 6, 1934, to fill the unexpired term of the late Senator Thomas J. Walsh.

Just a few months before my election, on May 11, 1934, the Nation had been startled by a tremendous dust storm that originated in the Great Plains and blew in a great cloud eastward over Washington, D.C., and on out to sea. Nothing like this had ever happened before in the United States.

In March 1935, when we of the Senate Public Lands and Surveys Committee were holding hearings on H.R. 7054, another great dust storm roared out of the West. The skies took on a copper color. The air became heavy with silt from 2,000 miles away.

We watched it from the windows of the Senate Office Building. Then we turned to listen again to the man who had been testifying all morning on the need for a national policy and program to protect our soil resources. That man was Hugh H. Bennett, whose pleas for erosion control had been largely unheeded for more than 25 years.

We had seen the devastating effects of land misuse with our own eyes. We acted swiftly. The House bill we had been considering speedily became Public No. 46, without a dissenting vote in either the Senate or the House, and a national conservation program, plus a new permanent agency to carry it out, was thus created.

That legislative act was the first of its kind in the world, and I am indeed proud that I assisted at its birth. It had been my privilege to help develop this program through its early stages, and into full-scale operations; and now, 25 years after its birth, I am still an anxious godfather. I intend to remain one.

Hugh Bennett, the "father" of soil conservation, became the first chief of the Soil Conservation Service. No other man could have even been considered for the job. Hugh Bennett, the "Messiah of the Soil" who stirred us into action, built from scratch what is now the greatest soil and water conservation technical organization in the world. He has seen his concept of using each acre of land within its capability and treating it according to its needs spread to more than 2,800 communities of the Nation, and to many other countries that have sent men here for training.

It was my privilege to work closely with Dr. Bennett, now retired for the past 8 years, and I salute him as a man to whom America owes a great deal; certainly more than can be put in words. And it has also been my privilege to be closely associated with his successors, the late Dr. Robert Salter, who succeeded Dr. Bennett, and the present Administrator, my friend Don Williams, who came up through the ranks of the Soil Conservation Service to become its Chief in 1953.

When we enacted Public Law 46, 25 years ago this month, we laid the groundwork for a national program for conserving soil and water resources on farm, grazing, and forest lands of the Nation. I am proud that I have been associated with many improvements and additions, including new legislation, that have

developed in response to needs of the program.

The original act, of course, established the Soil Conservation Service, only agency of Government that devotes all its resources to soil and water conservation. The Soil Conservation Service work started on a demonstration basis.

But it was obvious from the beginning that a demonstration program, although it showed how we could conserve soil and water on our farmlands, was not the final answer. We knew that Government could not do the job. It was a job for the farmers and ranchers themselves. But they needed help.

Thus we moved into a new phase of our national soil and water conservation program. At the suggestion of President Franklin D. Roosevelt the States began to enact soil conservation district enabling acts.

These State laws authorized farmers and ranchers to organize and manage local subdivisions of the State to plan and carry out locally adapted soil and water conservation and land-use programs.

The first soil conservation district in the world was organized in North Carolina in 1937. That was the beginning of what I consider to be the most significant movement in our agricultural history.

Farmers and ranchers everywhere liked soil conservation districts because they are farmer organized and farmer run. The farmers develop their own programs and they direct the job of carrying them out. Districts are the coordinating agency through which various kinds of needed State and Federal aid are channeled to cooperating farmers.

Districts formed a partnership with the Soil Conservation Service. Soil Conservation Service assigns technical specialists to districts upon requests. They help the leaders of the district carry out the district's program. Soil Conservation Service is a junior partner. I do not know of a finer relationship anywhere than the one that exists between local soil conservation districts and Soil Conservation Service technicians.

Soil conservation districts swept the country. Today there are more than 2,860 of them in the 50 States and in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Twenty-one States are completely covered by soil conservation districts, another 12 are more than 90 percent covered, 9 are between 80 and 90 percent and 5 are between 70 and 80 percent covered. More than 95 percent of the farms and ranches in the Nation are now within the legal boundaries of soil conservation districts. These districts have about 1.9 million cooperators.

Soil conservation districts have had tremendous impact upon American agriculture. They are changing the landscape of America into a pattern of utility and beauty. You can see the effects of their work almost anywhere you look.

More than 14,000 local men serve on the governing bodies of soil conservation districts. They are elected by their fellow farmers and ranchers. They serve without salary. These men are doing a great job for their communities and for

their country. I know of no more dedicated and unselfish group of people. The true worth of the work they are doing will be assessed fully only by future generations.

There have been many milestones in our quarter century of soil and water conservation. I should like to call attention to two more—both of them the outgrowth of experience that required legislation authorizing new programs.

Our national program was greatly strengthened when we of the Congress enacted the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act in 1954. We improved this legislation by amendments in 1956 and again in 1958.

The Small Watershed Act broadened the scope of the original Soil Conservation Act of 1935 by providing a means whereby the local people can obtain technical and financial assistance from the Federal Government in carrying out flood prevention and water management projects in small watersheds that the local people cannot complete with their own resources.

Prior to this legislation, we had been working at both ends of the problem but not in the middle. We had provided the means to solve soil and water problems on individual farms and ranches, and we had provided for big flood control and reclamation dams in major river basins. The new watershed act plugged the gap between.

Small watershed projects are handled in the same grassroots way that our national soil and water conservation program is handled through soil conservation districts. There is no dictation from the Federal Government. The local people themselves, through a responsible local organization, must initiate their own watershed projects, and they must participate in the planning, construction cost, and maintenance of them. Any application for Federal assistance must be approved by the State government.

The popular response to this program indicates its need. By April 1 of this year 216 small watershed projects were in operation, 538 others were in the planning stage, and an additional 524 local organizations had applications for assistance on file with the Soil Conservation Service.

Another soil and water conservation milestone was enactment of the Great Plains conservation program in 1956.

This program, tailored to the climatic hazards and low rainfall of the Great Plains States, including my own State of Montana, provides for technical and cost-sharing assistance to farmers and ranchers in developing and carrying out long-term land-use adjustments and a conservation plan under the terms of a contract with the Federal Government. The contracts run from 3 years to 10 years, and cost-shares are guaranteed for the life of the contract.

This program applies only to designated counties in an area that includes parts of Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming.

As of April 1, 4,222 farmers and ranchers operating 11¼ million acres had pre-

pared conservation plans and had entered into contracts to carry them out. Nearly 3,000 additional applications were on hand.

We have come a long way in a brief quarter century, but much remains to be done. I am proud to have had a continuing role in the development of our national soil and water conservation program. I shall continue to support it with the firm conviction that by so doing I am contributing to the present and future welfare and safety of the United States.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, Americans once had an unhappy record of squandering their originally abundant resources. When white men arrived on this continent, they found a land blessed beyond dreams with fertile soil and other natural resources. Assuming that these gifts of nature were inexhaustible, they dissipated and wasted them—often recklessly. Pioneers moved westward. They opened up new land for agricultural development, but many continued to waste the land by unwise farming methods.

Finally, we had to face up to a period of reckoning. In a time of drought in the 1930's, the soil began to move over large areas of the Great Plains. Excessive cultivation and lack of conservation had made the land vulnerable. We witnessed the spectacle of giant duststorms. People talked of the Dust Bowl. Obviously, something had to be done.

For many years, Dr. Hugh Bennett of North Carolina, a disciple of soil conservation, had been trying to bring America to a realization that it must take better care of its soil and water resources and move ahead with a program of conservation and wise land use.

Nevertheless, it was not until the dust from the Great Plains blew against the windowpanes of this Capitol Building that he got action. People in the East, as well as in the Midwest and Great Plains, all at once awakened to the fact that we were in trouble on the land.

The 74th Congress passed the Soil Conservation Act without a dissenting vote. It declared that soil erosion is a national menace and it made the conservation of soil and water resources a matter of national policy. The act also established the Soil Conservation Service as an agency of the Department of Agriculture.

I call this to the attention of the Senate for two reasons. First, because this is the 25th anniversary of the Soil Conservation Service and it is appropriate that we honor the men who make up this organization and who have done so much to halt the wasting of our soil and water resources.

The Soil Conservation Service is only 25 years old, but in that time it has rendered a service of which every citizen in this great country of ours can be proud.

It is also fitting on this occasion to recognize the 40 present Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives who were Members of the 74th Congress that enacted legislation of such far-reaching import.

I should also like to pay my respects to another organization, one that has played an important supporting role in

this conservation movement. I refer to the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts and the 14,000 soil conservation district supervisors who administer the district program.

About the time the Soil Conservation Service was established, farmers and ranchers were beginning to realize the dangers of soil erosion and the urgency for its control. Soil conservation districts was one important outgrowth of this realization. Organized under permissive legislation in each of the 50 States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, the 2,865 soil conservation districts now in existence cover 1½ billion acres of the Nation's farm and ranch land. These districts, as local units of government, are doing a tremendous job in soil and water conservation. They are serving effectively as the local managers and coordinators of local, State, and Federal conservation efforts.

Twenty-five years ago, responsibilities of the Soil Conservation Service were largely in the field of erosion control. Today Soil Conservation Service is responsible for many major functions. One in which I am particularly interested is the Great Plains conservation program, now functioning in parts of 10 Plains States.

Although I was born and reared in a Plains State, and was actively engaged in operation of my farm near Berlin, N. Dak., until I came to Washington in 1945, I had never fully realized the tremendous economic losses that this area was periodically suffering through drought, high winds, blizzards, hail, and hard rains.

The Great Plains conservation program is designed to help ranchers plan their operations so as to minimize the hazards of extreme weather, and it gives further emphasis to the soil conservation district program in attaining their soil and water conservation objective in the Plains States.

It is for these and many other reasons, which time does not permit me to go into now, that I direct your attention to the 25th anniversary of the Soil Conservation Service. Twenty-five years seems a long time in a human life. It is a short time in history. Yet in that time we have seen enormous conservation accomplishments and a major reduction in the erosion and loss of our priceless soil resources. The joint program of the Soil Conservation Service and soil conservation districts is having an effect—a vital, beneficial effect—on America's future.

That is why, on this occasion, it is fitting and proper that the Soil Conservation Service receive the recognition it so richly deserves for the magnificent job it has done to conserve and develop our soil and water resources—not only for the present generation, but for the Nation's growing population of the future.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is my pleasure at this time to recognize the 25th anniversary of the Soil Conservation Service. Twenty-five years ago today Franklin D. Roosevelt, as President of the United States, signed into law the first Soil Conservation Act adopted for the United States. This act declared soil and water conservation on

the lands of our Nation to be a permanent policy of the Congress. It called for the establishment of an agency of Government to be known as the Soil Conservation Service.

In its quarter century of existence the Soil Conservation Service has made for itself an outstanding reputation of service to agriculture and the entire Nation. I would summarize in four points the main reasons for this tremendous success.

First. The Soil Conservation Service has drawn into its ranks a corps of competent, scientific, dedicated public servants who have championed the cause of preserving America's natural heritage. These dedicated men have awakened millions of Americans to the need for soil and water conservation.

Second. The Soil Conservation Service developed the concept that each acre of farmland should be used within its capabilities and treated in accordance with its needs for protection and improvement—that each farmer needs to put into operation his own technically sound conservation plan for the soil, water, and timber resources upon which his family's livelihood and the Nation's long-term security depends.

Third. The Soil Conservation Service has taken the leadership in focusing public attention to the fact that vigorous and positive action for water conservation needs to move in step with our national program of soil conservation.

Fourth. The Soil Conservation Service conceived, developed, and nurtured the soil conservation district movement which I consider to be a model in the kind of a partnership that is needed between the private landowner and his Government.

The services of the Federal Government are made available to farmers through an agency of State government managed by local leaders elected by the local citizens. Under this arrangement nearly 2 million farmers in our Nation are receiving technical assistance in protecting and improving their land resources.

I think it worthwhile to review briefly how this arrangement was started, and I do this for a specific purpose.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt provided the inspired and needed leadership to get it started after the Congress had provided the basic legislation. In 1937, President Roosevelt sent to the Governor of each State a model soil conservation district law encouraging its enactment as it fit the State as a means through which the citizens of that State could seek the services of the Soil Conservation Service. Subsequently, all State legislatures enacted such legislation under which the people have now created 2,865 soil conservation districts covering most of the farms and ranches in the Nation.

The soil conservation program was launched by strong leadership at the very top of our Government. One of the dangers to the conservation movement today is the danger of official apathy. At the very time that our swiftly-growing population is building up explosive pressure upon our natural

resources, we find that much of the original zeal for conservation has disappeared from the high levels of government.

We need to have more imaginative and responsible action for helping farmers and local communities advance conservation more rapidly. And this 25th anniversary of the Soil Conservation Service is a proper time to recognize this need.

I want to pay tribute to the men in the Soil Conservation Service for the fine job they have done in helping America get started in protecting and improving our natural heritage during their first quarter century of operations. But the job is only started. There is an enormous amount yet to be done. We have a tremendous challenge ahead. We must have national leadership with sufficient zeal to take the actions needed to meet this challenge.

AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 743) to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, in order to remove the exemption with respect to certain mines employing no more than 14 individuals.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the pending bill—S. 743—entitled "The Mine Safety Act." During the time the bill was considered in committee, in 1958 and 1959, I was a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and participated in all the discussions in the Labor Committee.

My interest arises primarily from the fact that I serve in the Senate as a representative from Kentucky, a coal-mining State. Kentucky stands third among the States in the production of coal, being surpassed only by West Virginia and Pennsylvania. It is only natural that those who labor in the mines, mine operators, and all the business enterprises in the coal-producing areas, as well as the people of my State, should have a deep interest in any legislation affecting coal. And as a humane people we are particularly interested in measures which deal with the safety of the mine workers.

As I said a few minutes ago, no one can visit the coal-producing areas of our country, go into the mines and see the conditions under which miners must work, without being impressed with the necessity of every measure being taken to insure their safety.

I remember that in the summer of 1918 I went to Bell County and Harlan County, Ky., and worked at the coal mines there. This was not an extensive experience but I saw, for the first time, when I was 16 years of age, the difficult conditions under which miners must work. I was in the mines, I worked around the mines, for a limited period.

Since that time I have gone again and again to the coal-producing areas of eastern Kentucky and western Kentucky. I have been in the coal mines. I have talked to the miners. I know that theirs is a dangerous occupation. It is also

a necessary occupation. The coal miners are essential to the Nation's economy. Their work and the work and investment of coal operators is essential to the defense of the country. So, the people of my State, with its great coal-producing areas, both in western Kentucky and eastern Kentucky, are very much interested in this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a table which relates to coal production in 1958, showing the tonnage mined, its value, and the wages earned by the miners.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Coal boosts the economy of 26 States

State	Total production (net tons)	Value of production (f.o.b. mine price)	Recoverable reserves (net tons) assuming 50 percent recovery ²	Number of man-days worked ¹	Approximate aggregate State income from wages
			<i>Millions</i>		
Alabama	11,181,943	\$72,347,171	32,862	1,331,342	\$33,283,550
Alaska	759,282	6,932,244	80,000	59,814	1,495,350
Arkansas	364,138	2,741,959	761	49,745	1,243,625
Colorado	2,974,189	19,302,486	49,703	400,641	10,016,025
Georgia	8,751	43,755	38	2,734	31,000
Illinois	43,912,405	176,527,868	68,276	2,243,234	56,080,850
Indiana	15,022,224	58,436,451	17,529	758,713	18,967,825
Iowa	1,173,613	4,148,717	14,225	101,221	2,530,525
Kansas	823,322	3,713,182	10,376	54,087	1,352,175
Kentucky	66,311,805	280,119,469	59,146	5,479,323	136,983,075
Maryland	837,738	3,158,272	595	124,116	2,211,000
Missouri	2,592,162	11,120,374	39,400	228,068	5,701,459
Montana	304,961	1,476,011	110,853	33,796	844,909
New Mexico	116,656	717,434	30,753	42,254	502,233
North Dakota	2,313,858	5,414,427	175,367	65,745	1,443,625
Ohio	32,028,396	126,191,880	41,306	1,996,296	49,907,400
Oklahoma	1,629,443	10,832,990	27,309	174,944	4,373,600
Pennsylvania	67,770,862	374,685,158	35,760	7,227,142	180,678,550
South Dakota	19,571	78,284	1,015	2,300	69,750
Tennessee	6,784,600	25,985,018	12,458	825,351	20,683,775
Texas ³	(3)	(3)	15,438	(3)	(3)
Utah	5,327,516	30,366,841	46,421	523,945	13,098,625
Virginia	26,826,067	130,374,685	5,300	3,173,661	79,341,525
Washington	252,269	1,967,698	31,791	48,314	1,207,850
West Virginia	119,467,697	635,668,148	52,181	11,205,538	280,138,450
Wyoming	1,629,430	5,817,065	60,378	83,073	2,076,825
Total	410,437,898	1,995,996,695	1,019,232	36,238,242	904,403,528

¹ Figures for 1958: Production and employment from U.S. Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior.

² Reserves updated from 1954 U.S. Geological Survey on basis of Bureau of Mines' production figures.

³ Not available. Texas produces substantial quantities of lignite annually, but production figures are not reported.

Mr. COOPER. West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Ohio, along with Kentucky, are the leading coal-producing States of the Nation.

The Senate will remember that from 1941 to 1952 the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Mines extended only to the inspection of mines and to the making of recommendations for the correction of conditions which were deemed to be inimical to safety. The Bureau had no power to enforce its recommendations.

In 1952 Congress enacted certain amendments to the Federal Mine Safety Act. These amendments authorized the Federal inspectors of the Bureau of Mines to close title II mines in which conditions causing imminent danger of explosion, fire, inundation, man trip, or man hoist were found. I might explain that title II mines are defined as those which employ more than 14 miners.

The amended act of 1952 also authorized the Federal inspectors to inspect all coal mines with respect to a number of safety provisions specified in section 209 of the act relating to ventilation, roof support, equipment, explosives, and other matters. If a Federal mine inspector finds a violation of these provisions in title II mines he can direct that the deficiencies be corrected, and if the corrections are not made in the time fixed for their completion an order closing the mine may be issued.

The 1952 amendment to the act provided an exemption from the mandatory powers of the Federal Bureau, to mines

employing 14 or fewer miners. Those mines are called title I mines.

The bill which is being considered today was introduced in its original form by the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. Clark, the Senator from Illinois, Mr. Douglas, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. Scott, the Senator from Alaska, Mr. Gruening, the late Senator Langer, and other Senators. An identical bill, S. 2930, was introduced in February 1958, by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania and other Senators. The bills were introduced for the purpose of removing the exemption now applicable to the small mines, called title I mines, and of placing them under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Mines in the Department of the Interior, and to make the now applicable regulations to title II mines applicable also to title I mines.

Records introduced in the hearings show that in 1958 there were operating in the United States in that year 9,374 title I mines, or small mines, and 1,338 title II mines.

It can be asked why there should be any objection to removing the exemption given to title I mines, when the question of the safety of the men who work in the mines is involved. I may say for myself, categorically, that if S. 743 had presented only a question of safety, I would have voted for S. 743 in its original form. But, after the hearings began, it became apparent that other questions were involved. The true question involved is whether it is necessary to ap-

ply all the regulations of section 209 of the Mine Safety Act of 1952 to title I mines, and whether the application of these regulations will contribute to the safety of those who work in the small mines.

Second, if it should be determined that all of the regulations do not contribute to the increased safety of the miners, a serious economic question arises. Would the application of regulations which do not contribute to safety, because of their expense and impossibility of observance in small mines, have the effect of driving small mines out of business and consequently throwing out of work the thousands of miners who work in the small mines?

After a most thorough and deliberate consideration of the bill by the committee over a period of 2 years, the committee decided these were the real issues and that there was justice in these considerations. It did not report S. 743 as introduced, it reported the bill which the Senate is considering today, with the amendments which the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has described in some detail.

Because I opposed S. 743 in its original form—and I may say I opposed it vigorously in the committee, as the Senator from Pennsylvania and other committee members know—and because I offered some of the amendments which have been adopted in the pending bill, and joined in offering the other amendments; and because the people of Kentucky, particularly in the eastern section of Kentucky, which is a depressed area, have been much concerned about the effect of this bill and fear that it would close small mines, and lead to larger unemployment, I wish to speak about the issues raised in our deliberations in the committee.

I would like to point out the changes which have taken place in coal mining since World War II. Since World War II, the large coal operators in the United States faced with competition from other fuels—particularly oil and gas—and imports of residual oil have mechanized their mines with modern labor-saving equipment.

The United Mine Workers of America has, I think, with great vision, not opposed mechanization, but has joined with the operators in the mechanization of the large coal mines.

The testimony presented before the committee indicated that the cost of operating and equipping a large mine might run from \$500,000 to \$35 million per mine. In fact, Mr. Ankenny, Director of the Bureau of Mines, testified that he thought about \$10 million would be the cost of opening and equipping a large modern mine.

In order to operate such a mine, a large acreage of coal is required, either under the surface of the ground—and such mines are called shaft mines—or at the base of mountains, where the openings are driven into the sides of the mountains, and such mines are known as drift mines.

Mechanization has, of course, reduced the number of mines, as well as the num-

ber of miners. Through mechanization, the average production of coal per day per man in these large mines has risen to 14 tons, and, in fact, in some of the largest and best equipped mines one man can, with the aid of machinery, produce from 35 to 40 tons a day, contrasted to the 3 to 5 tons a day that a miner using the old-fashioned pick and shovel and auger can produce in a small mine.

As a consequence of mechanization, thousands of coal miners—both members of the United Mine Workers and nonunion miners—have lost their jobs. Unfortunately, thousands of them will never again be able to secure jobs in the large mechanized mines.

In the eastern part of Kentucky, where I live, 60,000 men were employed in the mines before the war, but today less than 30,000 are employed, and these men can produce with modern equipment more coal than was produced by the 60,000 miners who were employed before World War II.

We have talked a great deal about depressed areas. So far as the coal-mining section of Kentucky is concerned—and I am sure this is also true of Pennsylvania and West Virginia—one of the chief causes of depression in the coal-mining areas is that men are out of work because of the mechanization of the large mines and because many of them will never again be able to secure employment in the large mines.

But miners must make a living for themselves and for their families. They have opened the small mines. Sometimes one man will open and operate such a mine, sometimes with the aid of his son or his cousin or other members of his family; or a group of unemployed miners will join together and open and operate a small mine. These small mines have become necessary for the very existence of these men and their families. My concern that these men have a way to make a living for themselves and their families led me to insist that our committee look closely into every consequence of the enactment of Senate bill 743, as it was originally introduced.

There were other factors which had to be taken into consideration. As the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] stated in his opening remarks, the 1952 amendments to the Mine Safety Act provide an appeal procedure for title II mines, the large mines, when Federal inspectors direct the abatement or correction of conditions in the mines or when mine closing orders, under section 209, are issued. The appeal may be made to the Director of Mine Safety or to the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, here in Washington.

Review and judgment, which may be a closing order are made here in Washington. The large companies may have sufficient funds to be able to employ counsel, and undertake this complicated and expensive review procedure, as provided by the Federal Mine Safety Act of 1952; but I doubt that many of the small mine operators would have sufficient resources to employ counsel and undertake the long procedure to be able to appeal

from orders rendered against them by Federal inspectors.

I do not know how many Members of the Senate have seen these small mines and seen the men who operate them. Many of them eke out only a bare existence; I know that not many of them would have sufficient funds to be able to follow the complicated and expensive procedures for appeal and review, all the way to Washington. The law reads well; it gives substantive rights of review and appeal. But, practically speaking, when small miners do not have sufficient funds to be able to employ counsel to undertake this complicated procedure, for all practical purposes, the right of appeal is not available to the small mine operators.

I wish to make another point which is important to my State in connection with its consideration of the bill: As I have previously pointed out, the highly mechanized title II mines require large acreages of coal—hundreds or thousands of acres of coal—in order to make possible a return on expensive mechanization. But the small title I mines can be operated on 1 acre, 2 acres, 5 acres, 10 acres, or 50 acres of coal; and often these mines are operated on small plots of land owned by the very men who operate the small mines.

If it were to happen, under Senate bill 743, as originally introduced, or as now proposed, that the act would be administered in such a way as to require expensive changes in the layout of the small mines, without actually contributing to their safety, or if the procedures for review and appeal were to be so complicated and costly as to foreclose actual appeal, and result in the closing of these small mines, then the Federal Government, and, in particular, to the Bureau of Mine Safety, would be arrogating to itself authority to deny many small landowners in the coal-producing States the usual right of recovery of their natural resources, and to those States the opportunity to recover their wealth.

I should like to suggest to the Senate that if it were proposed that the Federal Government be given the power to provide that only large acreages of farmland or timberland, or only large acreages of land which contain natural resources could be developed, and that small areas could never be developed, such a proposal would be defeated overwhelmingly. Frankly, this is not a true analogy to the bill we are now considering; but I say that if this measure were administered in such a way, without contributing to the safety of the workers, as to force these small mines out of business, not only would thousands of miners be forced out of work, but, in addition, the economy of these depressed areas would be ruined. Such a development would be disastrous to every business and every person in the coal-producing areas of Kentucky and other States.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. However, is it not the intent of the Congress to do just the opposite?

Mr. COOPER. Yes; the committee intends that these small mines shall not be treated unfairly, and I shall make that point.

It is the intent of the Committee on Labor, and I am sure the Senate, that Bureau of Mine Safety and the Director of that Bureau and the Federal inspectors shall not deal arbitrarily or unfairly with these small mines.

Actually, Mr. President, the issue of comparative safety in title I small mines and title II large mines revolved around the statistical evidence produced to the committee by the Bureau of Mines. First, regarding the conditions in mines which lead to major disasters, including explosions, fires, and floods, there is no question that the record of the small mines for safety is much better than that of the large mines.

Mr. Ankeny, Director of the Bureau of Mines, so testified.

The evidence showed that over a period of 5 years a total of 24 men were killed in the small mines, which number seven or eight thousand. While we are, of course, very sorry that 24 were killed in the small mines, it is a fact that over the same period of 5 years in the larger mines many more were killed.

I want to be perfectly fair. The difficult question arose as to safety conditions which are set out under section 209 of the Mine Safety Act. I believe the members of the committee will have to agree that Mr. Ankeny admitted that the statistical evidence from which he drew his conclusions regarding section 209 violations was incomplete. I believe the members of the committee will also agree that Mr. Ankeny brought before the committee, on three different occasions in 1958 and 1959 different statistics regarding violations.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. Yes, I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I recall that there was before the committee a good deal of discussion about this question relating to accident rates on a man-hour-exposure basis as between the smaller and larger mines, and I agree that the Government figures presented originally did contain some discrepancies and that Mr. Ankeny did have to go back and revise his figures. But will not the Senator from Kentucky agree that when we got all through with the statistical argument, it nonetheless remained very clear that the fatality rate in the smaller mines was at least double the man-hour-exposure rate in larger mines? The figure I have shows 2.15 to 1.

Mr. COOPER. Yes; the last records which were produced by Mr. Ankeny were as the Senator from Pennsylvania has stated. I simply point out that there was a great deal of controversy and uncertainty over the accuracy of the records. Mr. Ankeny admitted they were not fully complete; and the fact that he had to revise them twice, indicated he could not have been too sure about them. The first time he appeared before the committee he presented them as the true statistics. Yet he came back twice with new statistics.

I do not deny that the last time he appeared the records showed, insofar as the section 209 requirements were concerned, that the fatality record for title I mines was greater than for title II mines.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator not agree that the conditions under which the large mines are operated would normally tend to make them have a larger major disaster rate than conditions under which smaller mines are operated? For example, large mines are deeper; they have more dangerous mining machinery; and they contain many electrical devices which are apt to trigger explosions. The distinction between the figures on fatalities, which are due to major disasters or to accident-type disasters, is irrelevant to a discussion of the bill, because increasing safety factors across the board is the objective of the legislation. The kind of disaster which occurs far too frequently in smaller mines is due, in many instances, to collapse of the ceilings or walls. They do not have man hoist accidents, for example, because they do not have man hoists or deep shafts.

Would the Senator not agree that we have to take those factors into consideration in weighing the statistics?

Mr. COOPER. Certainly; but we have to look at both sides of the question. It is true that the records show that major disasters have occurred more frequently in the larger mines than in the smaller mines. The entries to a smaller mine may go back into a hill 1,200 or 1,500 feet. But in a large mine there may be miles of entries, many rooms, and complicated equipment, which are more likely to be the scene of major disasters. On the other hand, the fact of the physical differences in the mines should lead the Director of the Bureau of Mine Safety to take these factors into consideration when he determines the regulations applicable to title I mines. For the complicated restrictions are not needed for title I mines, and this the committee has made clear.

I shall make one or two additional points and then I shall close. Other points appeared in the hearings. For example, the State boards have been doing a good job. The Senator will remember the testimony of Mr. Jame Phelan, chief of the Department of Mines and Minerals, Kentucky State Mine Department. He testified, as I remember, that his department made 11,000 inspections of the mines in Kentucky in 1 year. That was more than the Federal Bureau of Mines had made in all the coal-mining States of the United States in a year.

It will have to be considered that when this bill becomes law, if it does, the interest of the State bureaus of mine safety will diminish, because they will have no actual jurisdiction over the small mines. In my opinion, there will be fewer State inspections. As a result, safety conditions may not be improved.

It was further testified by Mr. Ankeny that another factor enters into mine safety—a factor hardly considered—and that is the factor of human error and judgment which miners, as all of us, unfortunately make.

There is another safety factor barely considered—the condition of roof and rib supports.

Several years ago the Bureau of Mines made a safety study. Mr. W. H. Tomlinson, of the Bureau of Mines, who made that study reported the greatest source of accidents came from inadequate roof and rib support. As yet, so far as we know, the Bureau of Mines has not done very much in this field.

In 1958, after we had concluded our hearings on S. 3290—identical to S. 743—the committee voted to report a bill which authorized the Director of the Bureau of Mines to close down mines in cases of imminent danger. It also directed the Bureau to conduct hearings to ascertain the causes of mine accidents, the incidence of fatalities and injuries in title I and title II mines, and to determine the economic effect of the Mine Safety Act of 1952 on small mines, if it should be applied to small mines. It was an amendment which I introduced in the committee, and the committee accepted after hearing all the testimony.

The bill was reported to the Senate unanimously in 1958. But for some reason it was never considered in the Senate.

It is now too late to discuss that bill. I only say that if the bill had been passed in 1958, we would have the information we need today.

I did my best during 2 years in the Committee to secure a fair bill—one that would provide greater safety for miners and yet protect small mines and their miners. As I have already said, the Senator from Pennsylvania and other committee members did the same.

I know I did all that was possible to get a fair bill to protect the little mines, and now I intend to vote for the bill.

The bill contains several amendments which will be helpful amendments which I offered or joined in offering. First, the bill makes it mandatory that the Director of the Bureau of Mine Safety conduct hearings to determine whether the regulations applicable to title II mines would contribute to safety in title I mines. If not, the Director is directed to cancel them so far as title I mines are concerned. It is a directive to draw a code applicable to title I mines—as distinguished from title II mines. I hope the Director of Mine Safety will consider this to be his duty under the bill. He has no alternative other than to consider it his duty—a duty directed by the Committee on Labor and the Congress, if this bill becomes law.

A second amendment to the bill provides, in the case of a small mine operator, that when an order for the abatement of an unsafe condition is made by a Federal inspector a hearing shall be held in the county in which the mine is located. This will be helpful to the small miner, and will enable him to secure a hearing at home.

Third, if a Federal inspector finds under section 209 a condition in a mine employing eight or fewer miners should be abated, the small mine operator may appeal from the finding before the mine is closed. This provision will be helpful

to the small mine operator, as he can keep his mine open while the appeal is heard.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy indeed my good friend from Kentucky is going to vote for the bill. The form in which the bill is now presented is a reflection of the hard work the Senator did.

A moment or two ago the Senator from Kentucky referred to the relationship between the State mine inspectors and the Federal mine inspectors. I recall very well the very able gentleman from Kentucky who came before the committee and testified concerning the large number of inspections made.

I invite my friend's attention, however, to the relationship, generally speaking, between State inspectors and Federal inspectors, which has been good. There is a telegram in the record, at page 247, dated January 28, 1959, from Joseph T. Kennedy, Secretary of Mines and Mineral Industries for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which asserts his support of the bill, and indicates that the coal miners working in the small coal mines would be helped by Federal cooperation. As a State official, he hopes the bill will pass.

Mr. COOPER. I remember that statement.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the telegram be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARRISBURG, Pa., January 28, 1959.

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Pennsylvania Department of Mines and Mineral Industries is in favor of the removal of the exemption in title I of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act. We believe that all safety rules and regulations should apply to smaller mines as well as to other mines. Federal cooperation in the promotion of safety for the coal miner working in the small coal mines would be well received by us. Your assistance in this matter will be appreciated.

JOSEPH T. KENNEDY,
Secretary of Mines and Mineral Industries.

Mr. COOPER. The fourth amendment in the bill provides that in case a Federal inspector finds a condition of imminent danger and makes a decision to close the mine, the mine operator, even though a State plan may not have been adopted, may ask for a State inspector to also examine the mine. If there is disagreement between the Federal inspector and the State inspector, then a request can be made for an independent inspector to be appointed by the district judge of the Federal court in the district in which the mine is located.

On the whole, as I have said, these amendments have given us a much better bill than the bill which was originally introduced.

I repeat, if it had been correct that S. 743, as originally introduced, involved only a question of mine safety, a question affecting the safety of the men who work in the mines, I would have voted

for it even though it would have meant the closing of some small mines, because the lives of the people who work in mines are more important than the material things which may be at stake. However, when it became clear that the regulations, now contained in the Federal Mine Safety Act and applicable to title I mines would not necessarily contribute to the safety of the men who work in these small mines but might close down small mines and put miners out of work, then these economic factors had to be taken into consideration.

I come from a State directly involved. We have had depressed conditions in the coal mine areas of eastern Kentucky for years.

I wanted to be sure that this bill, or at least as introduced, would not extend the depression in the coal mining areas of Kentucky and other States—that it would not put the small mines out of business, miners out of work, and hurt every business and person in these areas.

I earnestly hope that if this bill is passed, the Director of the Bureau of Mines will take into cognizance the concern and intent of the committee and the Congress about these matters, as he administers the bill. I earnestly hope the Director will not act arbitrarily, and close down small mines in my State and in other States unless it is necessary for safety. If he does so he will put out of business little mines. He would bring unemployment to thousands of coal miners who depend on these small mines for their living, and for the living of their families and their children.

I again thank the members of the committee for their thorough and careful consideration of the bill.

Mr. THURMOND, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. RANDOLPH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am opposed to passage of the bill because it would extend the long arm of the Federal Government into the States again. It seems that nearly three-fourths or more of the bills which come before the Congress are bills to extend the power of the Federal Government.

When the mine safety bill was passed a few years ago the little mines, those employing no more than 14 people, were exempt. Those mines have been under the jurisdiction of the States. Now an attempt is being made to change the provisions, to take the power away from the States and to bring it to Washington, D.C., to the Federal Government.

Mr. President, every week, every month, every year, we are building up more power in Washington, D.C.

Another reason why I am opposed to passage of the bill I think can be brought out from the testimony at the time I was a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as shown beginning on page 218 of the hearings on S. 743, S. 1562, and S. 2403, dated July 21, 22, and 24, 1959. The following colloquy took place:

Senator THURMOND. I have in my hand a table of accident data prepared by the U.S. Bureau of Mines, on March 27, 1958.

Mr. ANKENY. Is that in the hearings?

Senator THURMOND. It is given on page 90 of the hearings on this bill. I believe that Public Law 552 which is the law giving the Federal Bureau of Mines the power to enforce safety regulations was passed in 1952, was it not?

Mr. ANKENY. That is correct.

Senator THURMOND. And in 1952 according to these figures, and if they are not right I would like for you to say so, fatal accidents were 0.88.

Mr. ANKENY. Yes.

Senator THURMOND. You have a copy of those figures there before you?

Mr. ANKENY. Yes. That is frequency rates; yes, sir.

Senator THURMOND. Of fatal accidents?

Mr. ANKENY. Yes, sir.

Senator THURMOND. In 1953, 0.85.

Mr. ANKENY. Yes.

Senator THURMOND. And in 1954, 0.96.

Mr. ANKENY. Yes.

Senator THURMOND. And in 1955, 0.88.

Mr. ANKENY. Yes.

Senator THURMOND. In 1956, 0.99.

Now isn't it true that since the passage of this act the fatal accident rate per million hours of exposure in title II bituminous mines has increased in spite of the efforts of the Federal Bureau of Mines and the United Mine Workers and the coal operators and the others?

Mr. ANKENY. You mean—

Senator THURMOND. I am asking you that question.

Mr. ANKENY. If they have increased?

Senator THURMOND. Is it not true that the fatal accident rate per million hours of exposure in title II bituminous mines has increased since the passage of Public Law 552?

Mr. ANKENY. No, sir; that is not true.

Senator THURMOND. Then are these figures wrong I have just read to you?

Mr. ANKENY. No; these figures are correct, I believe.

Senator THURMOND. Well, if these figures are right—let us go over them again.

Mr. ANKENY. All right.

Senator THURMOND. In 1952 the figure was 0.88; and in 1953, 0.85, which is a decrease that year and the only year since the act went into effect.

In 1954 it was 0.96; and in 1955, 0.88; and in 1956, 0.99.

Do not these figures show an increase in percentages for each year since Public Law 552 went into effect except the 1 year, 1953, right after the act was passed?

Mr. ANKENY. Yes, sir; they do, but that is not what you asked me the other time.

Senator THURMOND. Well, what do they indicate, then?

Mr. ANKENY. Well, they indicate to me—the figures, in the first place, are not complete, but if you compare the record of mine accidents from 1952 since the act was passed with the previous record of a similar length of time, it would show that they have decreased, not increased.

Senator THURMOND. Well, percentage-wise these figures show an increase except for 1 year.

Mr. ANKENY. From year to year they show an increase except for 1 year, that is correct.

Senator THURMOND. Since the passage of Public Law 552 in 1952.

Mr. ANKENY. Yes, sir; that is correct.

That shows that even since the Federal law was enacted, supposedly on the theory of providing safety, the accident rate has increased every year except one. So who has done the best job—the Federal Government or the States? The figures speak for themselves. They show that the States have done a good job. They show that the accident rate has increased since this activity has been under the Federal Government.

I believe that the pending bill is being pushed by certain groups for certain purposes, and that the real intent is not safety. I am as much in favor of safety as anyone else. I am in favor of protecting the mine workers. But what Congress will do if it does not watch out is to close the small mines. When we have Federal regulation and Federal regimentation in every phase of life, we can expect trouble in the end, because we know that the more Federal regulation there is, the more Federal regimentation there is, the more the cost of living will go up, the more inspectors there will be, the more Government employees there will be, the more retirement there will be, and the more overhead expense there will be.

In the end, whom does it come out of? It comes out of the taxpayers, and it will come out of the small mine workers, as well as everyone else.

The small mines are not in a position to pay the large overhead and compete with large mines. When the Congress enacted the law in 1952, I presume it had in mind that it wanted to exempt the small mines from Federal regulation, because they could not afford to stand the additional expense.

I think it would be a great mistake, from an economic standpoint, from the standpoint of the welfare of the country, and from the standpoint of the employees in the small mines, who would stand a chance in the future of losing their jobs altogether, to pass the pending bill. As I mentioned when I started to speak, the bill would increase the power of the Federal Government to take over certain mines that are now under the jurisdiction of the States.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE GOVERNOR OF HAWAII

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I am very happy to present to the Senate the Governor of the State of Hawaii, who is performing an outstanding public service in the new State of Hawaii, which will become one of the greatest States of the Union. I present Gov. William F. Quinn.

Mr. KEATING. Governor Quinn was born in my part of the State of New York. Later he moved to St. Louis. As a result, it is sometimes said that he comes from St. Louis. However, he is not like a man I have heard about who was born in one city and then moved to another, and each city claimed that the other city was his closest affiliation. In this case we are very proud that the city of Rochester has produced such a distinguished citizen as Governor Quinn.

I have visited Hawaii and enjoyed its hospitality. I strongly urge all of my colleagues in the Senate to visit Hawaii. I also know of the magnificent work Governor Quinn is doing in our newest State, and I am pleased to welcome him here today.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure that all of us are very happy to have the Governor of our newest State visit us in the Senate. I am also sure that everything that has been said about his work as Governor is correct. I am proud to welcome him to the Senate Chamber. I may say to him

that we are also very proud of the Senators Hawaii has sent to us here.

Mr. FONG. I am deeply thankful to my colleagues for their extremely kind remarks. I know that any Member of the Senate who will visit Hawaii will receive a fine Hawaiian aloha.

AMENDMENT TO FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 743) to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act in order to remove the exemption with respect to certain mines employing no more than 14 individuals.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask for the third reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the measure now before us in this forum is essential legislation when considered in the context of respect for human life. I am one of the Senators from the State of West Virginia, in which bituminous coal mining is a dominant industry, even though it supplies much less employment now than it did prior to the acceleration of technological changes in our methods of production. Nonetheless, the coal industry is an essential one in the pattern of West Virginia's economy, and, indeed, in the structure of our national security, especially at this time of an uneasy truce in conflicts of a worldwide nature, and necessarily in the actual prosecution of any war in which this Republic and its people should be engaged.

Even though mining is a hazardous occupation, we must not only hope but we must strive for the time when there will be no fatalities in these operations.

So, today, it is not only appropriate that we consider this proposed legislation, but it is also the responsibility of the membership of the Senate very earnestly to consider the provisions which are contained in S. 743.

Mine safety is a battle which must be fought constantly by all who are concerned. There is no cutoff point for those who are concerned with the safety and the well-being of the miners of our country. It is important, of course, to our coal miners, and to our producers and to the State departments of mines, which have been mentioned today. I do not speak in disparagement of the work that has been done and is being done by State departments of mines. I am only saying that in this area of mine safety there is a very natural compact which has come about between State departments of mines and the Federal Bureau of Mines through the administration of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act from its inception and its amendment, until today we face our responsibility again. It is a problem, of course, of the State

legislative bodies, too. In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and in West Virginia and in Kentucky and in other coal mining areas of this Nation we have come to grips with this problem, and we have attempted, sometimes by a drastic approach, and at other times by a more considerate approach, to reach the time when the safety of the miners themselves will be served best.

Mr. President, I add once again that it is the responsibility of Congress and of all Members of this forum today to act in what I believe to be a necessary and positive way on this subject.

EVERY MINER ENTITLED TO PROTECTION

Every man—and I emphasize the words "every man"—who toils beneath the surface of the earth needs and is entitled to full protection from all sources. I say in no disparagement of the speeches which I heard earlier today in this Chamber that there is an indication of what I believe to be a very cautious attitude—frankly, an attitude which I believe is not well founded. When the Federal Government seems to indicate, through laws which are passed by Congress and administered by agencies, that there is concern for a problem of this type, we are alleged to be delving, as it were, into fields which the Federal Government should not enter. I do not agree with this viewpoint.

This is not a new advocacy on my part, because when I was privileged to have the responsibility of serving in the House of Representatives, I was a militant supporter of mine safety. I believe it appropriate at this point to say for the Record that Senator Matthew Mansfield Neely, who served so effectively in this body over a long period of years—and there are Senators here today who remember his service—carried forward most zealously his efforts in behalf of mine safety, not in the fifties, not in the forties, but in the thirties, when this was a subject for necessary action in the Congress.

Mr. President, when I served in the House of Representatives as a member of the Mines and Mining Committee, I was the chairman of the Subcommittee on Coal. Because of studies which I made, I came to wholeheartedly support the passage of what we thought at the time as being a comprehensive mine safety bill.

It is a matter of record that the coal industry, in the period before enactment of effective mine safety legislation, counted its injuries in five figures, and its fatalities at more than 2,500 in a single year. The fatalities for the year 1957, as an example of the positive impact of a Federal safety law, had dropped from the figure I gave to 452, and in 1959 to less than 360, according to information which I believe to be correct.

But in spite of gratification which we as Senators may feel concerning the decline in fatalities, and in spite of my personal satisfaction at having been a supporter of the original mine safety measures at the Federal level, I declare emphatically that 360 coal mine fatalities in a period of 12 months constitute too many deaths for this industry—or,

in fact, for any industry. We must erect proper safeguards around those who toil within its operation.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST FEDERAL ACTION OVERCOME

I remember well the principal arguments—fallacious, I believe—which were used against the passage of the original mine safety bill. I have heard them made again today on the floor of the Senate by those who oppose the pending measure. Doubtless other Senators likewise are hearing that "it is too costly"; that "we cannot afford to do all the things the Federal law requires"; that "we will have to shutdown operations and put men out of work"; or, the oldest of all, namely, that "our State examinations are sufficient, and Federal examination is unnecessary duplication."

It is a well-established fact, despite the forecast years ago that the mines would forever close if the originally proposed mine safety bill became law, the more safely engineered, efficient, well-managed mines have not ceased to operate and to produce.

We know that State examinations were not, in themselves, adequate safety expedients for the miners and the producers alike.

We are aware, too, that Federal examiners, having power to close unsafe mines, did bring more safety to mining operations and communities throughout the coal-producing areas. Comparative fatality and injury statistics speak effectively and factually in this respect.

When the original mine safety legislation was enacted, it was anticipated that the fact a Federal inspector might be making an appearance at any mine, anywhere, at any time, would tend to keep the State inspectors more alert to the need of facing up to their duties and to do their utmost to halt violations of safety standards.

So there was an awareness then, and there still is, in some instances, that perhaps there was too much laxness and neglect in the matter of State inspections in those earlier days. In the State of West Virginia, marked improvement has been shown.

These factors—but mostly the indisputable excessiveness of injury and death in the mines—brought about the passage of the Federal Mine Safety Act.

FEDERAL INSPECTION PRINCIPLE NOT NEW

It is right and proper that there should be Federal inspection of mines. That principle was not established yesterday; it was established years ago. I cannot detect proper reasoning in any provision for safety measures which limits the extension of Government protection to men who accept work in mines employing more than 14 employees, and withhold the same protection to employees of mines in the same neighborhood—or, for that matter, in other communities—which employ 14 or fewer men.

Why should a mine on one side of a road, and employing 14 or more men, have to be kept in a safe condition under Federal and State law, while a mine on the other side, which hires 14 or fewer employees, completely escape the neces-

sity of having the same Federal law enforced with respect to its operations?

The answer to such a question is obvious, namely, that all miners should be entitled to equal protection against unsafe work conditions.

I share the sentiment stated by the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. He expressed a genuine concern that nothing we will do here today might seem to compound or even to initiate any hardship of operation—and I hope successful operation—of the mines of the country.

We in West Virginia are conscious of the contribution which has been made to our economy by the operators and the workers within the smaller mines. We are conscious of the value of that type of small business in our economy.

But there is a safeguard in existing mine law against arbitrary or illegal orders which might erroneously be issued by any Federal inspector of the U.S. Bureau of Mines. The bill, as I hope it will be passed today, does not disturb the appeal section, to which mine operators may properly resort; in fact, by the changes wrought by amendments, it has been strengthened.

I speak with feeling on this subject, because I believe the proposed legislation is in the public interest and will provide a greater degree of safety for the men who labor within the coal mines. I trust that it will become the law of the land.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the passage of the mine safety bill will mark an important step forward in safeguarding the lives and the health of the courageous men who work in the Nation's mines.

I was chairman of the subcommittee from which this bill came. The bill was pushed with extreme vigor by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. He was joined by a member of the Subcommittee on Labor, the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who has just spoken.

The harsh fact of the matter is that the fatality rate in the small mines—to which the bill extends Federal protection and Federal standards—is twice the fatality rate in the larger mines, which are now covered by Federal legislation.

I am confident that the passage of this badly needed legislation will greatly lower the high accident rate and will help to assure the physical safety of thousands of the Nation's miners. There is no more hazardous or demanding labor than the work of those who toil in our mines.

I had the opportunity to visit a coal mine yesterday. I must say that after visiting it and talking with the men who worked in it, I believe more than ever that the proposed legislation is in the public interest. I hope the Senate will act favorably on the bill. I think such legislation is overdue.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I am sure there is not a man alive who does not wish devoutly for the absolute maximum of safety in all coal mining operations.

In this late day of enlightenment, I do not believe we can accuse anyone of deliberately failing to take necessary, appropriate, and feasible precautions against such accidents as happen in mines.

Coal mining is a substantial industry in Virginia. As a World War I fuel administrator, as a former Governor of Virginia, and as Senator from Virginia, I think I am qualified to discuss coal-mine safety legislation. This long study and experience have led me to the conclusion that complete mine safety cannot be legislated any more than other kinds of accident prevention.

Individual consciousness for safety precaution developed through continuing education and warning is the most effective deterrent to accidents. Two bills—S. 2403 and S. 1562—have been introduced in the Senate at this session to promote Federal participation in this constructive approach. But instead of these bills, we have before us the provisions of a third bill, S. 743.

As introduced, Senate bill 743 would have the effect of trying to legislate coal mine safety in small mines, now under State supervision, which cannot possibly conform to the Federal requirements it would force upon them.

The committee has modified slightly the original provisions; but as the bill is now before the Senate, it is definitely a foot in the door which may lead to the destruction of the small coal mine industry.

Under present coal mine safety law, Federal regulations are applied to big coal mine operations, which are referred to as title II mines. The regulation, inspection, and so forth, of small mines, now defined as mines employing 14 men or less, and referred to as title I mines, are left to State jurisdiction.

The provisions of Senate bill 743, as introduced, would put the so-called title I small truck mines employing 14 men or less under the same complex Federal regulations which govern the biggest coal mine operations in the world.

The committee has modified slightly these original provisions, and would set up a new class of mines for those employing less than eight persons underground, but I doubt that the ultimate effect would be very much of a change.

The title I small mines are, in fact, under more appropriate and better State inspection and regulation than that which could be provided under a Federal law designed primarily for application to big operations.

I assert that Virginia can better take care, within the State, of the safety requirements, enforcement and inspection for small truck mines than the Federal Government could.

In making this statement, I rely not only on my own experience and study, but also on the testimony of Mr. J. B. Taggart, whom I have known and admired for many years. Mr. Taggart has been in the coal-mining business for a lifetime. On July 22, he appeared before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee as a special representative of the Governor of Virginia and of the commissioner of the State depart-

ment of labor and industry. Mr. Taggart supported Senate bills 2403 and 1562 as proposed legislation which definitely could serve the purposes of small-mine safety and individual education of miners in terms of mine safety. Federal legislation such as that proposed in those bills is supported by all of the small-mine industry. But it is opposed by segments of the big-mine industry and the mine union.

The whole small-mine industry has opposed the provisions of S. 743, as introduced; and I think the provisions of the bill as recently reported by the committee represent little improvement.

Mr. Taggart in his testimony before the committee said Senate bill 743 not only would impede the efforts of States for safety in small mines, but also would harass, if not eliminate, the small coal mines in the United States.

These small-mine operations actually make a tremendous contribution to the economy of the Nation. They are employing some 30,000 to 40,000 miners. Many of them have been displaced from their jobs in big mines, by mechanization. In addition, these small mines are salvaging from our natural resources from 40 million to 50 million tons of coal a year which otherwise would be lost.

This proposal to extend Federal mine safety laws and regulations to small mines is put forth in the name of mine safety. On the surface, this presumes that extension of Federal jurisdiction will improve the safety record in these truck-mines.

I personally have looked into the statistical data available from the Federal Bureau of Mines; and I submit that they are neither adequate nor sufficiently accurate to be used as the basis for legislation.

I am supported in this conclusion by an exhaustive study conducted by Mr. Taggart and Mr. B. F. Reed, whose qualifications and reputation are beyond reproach. Both men have spent a lifetime in the coal-mining industry, and they have spent much time and money in the development of the record for the title I coal mine industry. They have gone to the sources of the very best information available.

On the record, both of these gentlemen dispute the Bureau of Mines figures on title I mines. They have challenged the figures in formal communications to the Department of Interior; and they have challenged the accuracy of the Bureau figures, before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Their facts and figures have not been denied. On the contrary, the inadequacy of the Federal reporting on small mines has been conceded.

On last July 20, Mr. Elmer F. Bennett, Acting Secretary of the Interior said the Department preferred Senate bill 2403, providing for a survey and study of conditions in these small mines.

The Director of the Bureau of Mines, under cross-examination by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], in the Labor and Public Welfare Committee hearings this year, admitted that the Federal Bureau does not have correct

figures on employment, production, hours of exposure, or non-fatal accidents in title I mines. In fact, he conceded that the Federal figures were, at best, no better than 80 percent correct.

Frankly, from my observations there are vast differences in conditions and types of operations as between title I and title II mines; and these differences must be taken into account in making any comparison of records. We have no objection to the enactment of legislation which will provide for proper and adequate development of these facts by the Bureau of Mines, under Senate bill 1562, or by an independent commission, under Senate bill 2403, as the Interior Department proposes.

But I submit that the putting of small coal mines out of business by making an extension to them of complex Federal law and regulations cannot be justified. It certainly cannot be justified by the kind of facts and figures produced to date by the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. President, the pending bill has now been improved to some extent by means of the adoption of an amendment which was submitted by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]; and I am a cosponsor of the amendment. The amendment is on page 2, in line 3, and it reads as follows:

The Director (of the Bureau of Mines) may, by regulation, establish, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to interested parties, modify or make inapplicable any provision, or part thereof, of section 209 (of the Federal mine safety law) which he finds, after hearings, do not substantially contribute to the safety of men working in small mines.

This provision is broad and far reaching. It would give the Director of the Bureau of Mines the power to decide whether an act of Congress should be applied. It would be applied solely at his discretion.

It could develop that one Director would determine that the law should be applied, and the next Director should hold that it should not be applied. The confusion would be insufferable.

This amendment simply changes the word "may" to the word "shall." That change will result in some improvement of this bill. The amendment would make it mandatory for the Director of the Bureau of Mines to modify or make inapplicable any provisions of the Federal mine safety law found to be unnecessary for small mines.

However, Mr. President, even with this amendment added to the bill, I am opposed to the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, today the Senate is taking a historic step to further protect the lives of the miners who toil underground in our coal mines.

In passing this bill we know that the same protection which is now granted to men working in large mines will be extended to those working in mines employing 14 or fewer miners.

We hope that disasters such as those which happened in Maryland on April 11 and in Kentucky on the same day at almost the same hour will be prevented.

In these disasters three men in each mine lost their lives because of a roof fall or cave-in. This may seem to be a small number of men, but it is all that were working in each mine. If there had been 25 or 50 men, they would all have been killed.

The bill now pending not only extends the protection of Federal safety inspection to small mines, but it also provides for easier appeals from the rulings of Federal inspectors by small mine operators to the appropriate administrative agency, and it specifically provides that employers operating small mines may have the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review come to the immediate area where the mine is being operated and hold a hearing on an appeal in the county seat of the county in which the mine is located. Thus, the operator of a small mine will not be forced into an expensive procedure which would require him to go to Washington to present his case.

I repeat, Mr. President, that, in my opinion, the Senate is taking important action to protect the lives of coal miners in approving S. 743.

I express my appreciation to the author of the bill, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and every Senator who supported it, and particularly the able occupant of the chair, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], for the contributions they have made in this debate. They have talked to me a number of times about the desirability for this type of legislation, and it is on their recommendation that the measure is before the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement by my colleague [Mr. MORTON], who is unavoidably absent on official business.

My colleague has been very much interested in this legislation. He has been much concerned lest Senate bill 743, as originally introduced, might put many small mines out of business and throw out of employment many miners in such mines. My colleague has worked hard to obtain the amendments now in the bill, which, while insuring safety to miners, give greater protection to the small mines.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORTON

I know of no group of men more deserving of our respect and admiration than the coal miners of our Nation. Theirs is the unspectacular task of extracting from the earth a valuable energy resource of incalculable benefit to our national economy.

Coal mining is usually done under conditions of extreme hazard which constantly subject the miners to a high degree of personal risk. The industry has clearly recognized this hazard, and in order to secure the safety of its employees has done everything possible to maintain the safest possible working conditions.

This safety-minded and safety-conscious industry is constantly striving to reduce all accidents, whether fatal or nonfatal, through aggressive programs of education, promotion, demonstration and enforcement. The miners certainly are entitled to personal security from harm, and I certainly would be the last person to oppose any legislation which the miners themselves felt would give them a greater measure of protection from death or personal injury.

I think that the experience of recent years, in our study of the situation brought to focus by S. 743 of the 86th Congress and identical legislation during the 85th Congress, has demonstrated that mine safety is not a clear-cut issue. One would assume that since it involves mine safety that all miners would rally around the cause. This has not been the case.

When Congress enacted legislation during the 82d Congress as a basis to prevent coal mine disasters, mines employing 14 or fewer employees underground were exempt from the mandatory compliance provisions of the law. The mining industry usually refers to these operations as title I mines, and to those with 15 or more employees as title II.

The original intent of S. 743 simply repealed the title I exemption, but the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I feel, acted wisely and prudently in amending the bill in the form reported to the Senate. Although the exemption repealer is still in the bill, the provisions for appeal from an inspector's finding prior to closing down a mine have minimized the fears of the title I operators.

I would also like to commend the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] for the understanding he has displayed of our problem and for his accepting our amendment concerning modification or nullification of section 209 provisions not applicable to improving safety conditions in the small mines.

Although the bill is now much more palatable to the small mine operators and their employees, they still firmly contend that S. 743 will not contribute materially to their safety. They see only one purpose in S. 743, and that is to force them out of business.

The issue of mine safety from the legislative point of view is not a simple one. It is, to the contrary, complex and controversial, and I would like to emphasize to my colleagues that S. 743 draws its major support from those who do not need it and is vigorously opposed by those it allegedly would help.

The national coal wage agreement between the United Mine Workers of America and signatory operators provides for the enforcement of safety regulations far more stringent than the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act. The union-company contracts incorporate the entire Federal Coal Mine Safety Code, which includes all of the provisions of the Federal law and many more.

The safety provisions are enforceable on all unionized mines, whether title I or title II, and it must logically follow that enactment of S. 743 will in no way whatsoever increase the safety security of miners working in these mines. Yet, the United Mine Workers union is the most vocal of all groups supporting the Clark bill. While I agree with the UMW that our miners should have the safest possible working conditions, I cannot believe that its intentions are motivated strictly by paternalistic sympathy for thousands of miners it does not control.

There is undivided sentiment among the small mine operators that mine safety legislation is nothing more than an economic club to pound them out of existence. I have heard this assertion time and time again from gentleman of intelligence and integrity whose entire lives have been spent mining coal, and I respect their judgment and opinions. I had hoped that before considering any legislation in this area and in view of the

conflict that we might have had the benefit of a thorough investigation of the safety and economic factors before undertaking any changes in the present law.

The coal mining industry has undergone quite an upheaval during the past 15 years, and the complicated situation in which we find ourselves today stems directly from that upheaval. In order to adjust itself, strictly as a matter of survival, to the loss of markets and to remain competitive in the fuels market, the industry turned to mechanization. Thousands of miners were displaced by machinery, and as they were forced from their jobs they turned to the small mines to continue the only occupation they have ever known.

The mines in Kentucky employ, on the average, from four to six employees. The capital required to open a small mine, usually on leased acreage, is very small. In many instances, the mines are strictly family operations. The small mine industry is an integral component of the economic structure of the Kentucky coal fields. In community after community, income derived from the small mines is the only source of income. The thousands of small mine employees are earning a living at jobs which keep them off the welfare list. They are responsible citizens in their communities, and I shudder to think what would have happened in the eastern Kentucky coal belt, already economically depressed, had it not been for the small mines.

The small mine operators are as concerned for the safety of their employees as the larger operators. Mine safety to them is personal and very realistic because in many mines they work shoulder to shoulder with other miners. They sincerely challenge the claim that Senate 743 will give them greater safety, and genuinely fear that should they be required to install expensive equipment to abate a disaster-type condition there will be no alternative but to cease operation.

The operating conditions in most title I mines are totally unlike those in title II operations. The mines are shallow, not deep; they do not have a large concentration of men at points of greatest peril; they do not experience the machine noise and dust which dull perceptory senses; they are not exposed to the constant danger of moving machinery.

I was a member of the House Committee on Labor and Education during the 82d Congress which considered H.R. 7408, later enacted as Public Law 552. In our report we made an unmistakable distinction between major disasters and ordinary day-to-day accidents. Public Law 552 is not a law enacted, nor was it intended, to reduce, control or eliminate the day-to-day type of accidents which account for the majority of all coal mine fatalities. We made it clear that Federal authority was restricted to major disasters, reserving the responsibility for controlling day-to-day accidents to the States. Subsequently, the Department of the Interior in 1954 urged greater Federal-State cooperation to bring State standards up to Federal levels, the sole purpose being the gradual withdrawal of Federal inspection from the inspection field. I feel that S. 743 will only lead to further Federal intrusion into strictly a State matter.

The title I exemption was granted in 1952 only after careful and intensive consideration. The danger of major disasters in small mines is negligible, and the Bureau of Mines admitted at the time that full enforcement among thousands of isolated mines would present a tremendous task.

I want to make it clear that the small mine industry is not opposing mine safety. If they thought remedial legislation were needed they assuredly would be the first to ask for it. I feel that Public Law 552 has done an excellent job in the major disaster prevention field, and yet disasters still occur in our mines. This is probably due

to a great extent to the revolutionary changes we have seen in mining technology since the law was enacted. I hope that if S. 743 is enacted into law, that those empowered with its enforcement will administer it with the sole idea of improving mine safety and not for the purpose of shutting down the small mines, as many have feared will be the consequence.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend as Chairman of the Economic Committee a meeting of the NATO Parliamentary Conference at Strasbourg, France.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 4, as follows:

[No. 166]
YEAS—80

Alken	Bartlett	Bridges
Allott	Bible	Brunsdale

Bush	Goldwater	McNamara
Butler	Gore	Magnuson
Byrd, W. Va.	Hart	Mansfield
Cannon	Hartke	Martin
Capehart	Hayden	Monroney
Carlson	Hennings	Moss
Carroll	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Case, N.J.	Hill	Murray
Case, S. Dak.	Holland	Muskie
Church	Hruska	Pastore
Clark	Humphrey	Prouty
Cooper	Jackson	Proxmire
Cotton	Johnson, Tex.	Randolph
Curtis	Johnston, S.C.	Saltanston
Dirksen	Jordan	Schoeppel
Dodd	Keating	Scott
Douglas	Kefauver	Smathers
Dworshak	Kennedy	Smith
Eastland	Kerr	Talmadge
Ellender	Kuchel	Wiley
Engle	Long, Hawaii	Williams, N.J.
Erwin	Lusk	Yarborough
Fong	McCarthy	Young, N. Dak.
Frear	McClellan	Young, Ohio
Fulbright	McGee	

NAYS—4

Byrd, Va.	Stennis	Thurmond
Robertson		

NOT VOTING—16

Anderson	Javits	Russell
Beall	Lausche	Sparkman
Bennett	Long, La.	Symington
Chavez	Morse	Williams, Del.
Green	Morton	
Gruening	O'Mahoney	

So the bill (S. 743) was passed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1319, S. 3058, and I invite the attention of the Senator from Arkansas to this request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3058) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Mutual Security Act of 1960".

CHAPTER I—MILITARY ASSISTANCE

Military assistance

SEC. 101. Chapter I of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to military assistance, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 103, which relates to authorizations, insert the following new subsection (d):

"(d) The value of programs of equipment and materials for American Republics, pursuant to any authority contained in this chapter other than section 106, in any fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year 1961, shall not exceed \$55,000,000. For the purposes of this subsection, the value of non-excess equipment and materials shall be as defined in section 545(h) of this Act, and the value of excess equipment and materials (as excess is defined in section 545(h))

of this Act) shall mean the acquisition cost to the Armed Forces of the United States of such equipment and materials."

(b) In section 105(b)(4), which relates to conditions applicable to military assistance, strike out the last sentence.

CHAPTER II—ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

Defense support

Sec. 201. Title I of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to defense support, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 131(b), which relates to general authority, strike out "1960" and "\$751,000,000" and substitute "1961" and "\$700,000,000", respectively.

(b) In section 141, which relates to conditions of eligibility for assistance, strike out "No such assistance" in the second sentence and substitute "No defense support or military equipment and materials".

(c) In section 142(a), which relates to agreements, strike out "No assistance" in the introductory clause and substitute "No defense support or military equipment and materials".

Development Loan Fund

Sec. 202. Title II of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to the Development Loan Fund, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 201, which states the purposes of the Development Loan Fund, as follows:

(1) In the last sentence, after "to develop their economic resources" insert "and free economic institutions", and after "to increase their productive capabilities" insert "in agriculture as well as in industry".

(2) At the end of the section, add the following new sentences: "The Congress recognizes that the accomplishment of the purposes of this title in rapidly developing countries requires the development of free economic institutions and the stimulation of private investment, local as well as foreign, in the field of housing. It is the sense of the Congress that, consistent with the other purposes of this title, special consideration should be given to loans and guarantees to stimulate activities in this field."

(b) In clause (3) of the first sentence of section 202(b) insert "or free economic institutions" after "economic resources".

(c) In section 205(a), which relates to management, powers, and authorities, strike out "Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs" in the first sentence and substitute "Secretary of State".

(d) Insert after section 206 the following new section 207:

"SEC. 207. HOUSING PROJECTS IN LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES.—It is the sense of the Congress that in order to stimulate private homeownership, encourage the development of free financial institutions, and assist in the development of a stable economy, the authority conferred by this title should be utilized for the purpose of assisting in the development in the American Republics of self-liquidating pilot housing projects designed to provide experience in countries at various stages of economic development by participating with such countries in (1) providing capital for the establishment of, or for assistance in the establishment of, savings and loan type institutions in such countries; and (2) guaranteeing private United States capital available for investment in Latin American countries for the purposes set forth herein."

Technical cooperation

Sec. 203. Title III of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to technical cooperation, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 304, which relates to authorization, strike out "\$179,500,000" and "1960" and substitute "\$172,000,000" and "1961", respectively.

(b) Amend section 306, which relates to multilateral technical cooperation and related programs, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), which relates to contributions to the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance and related fund, strike out "\$30,000,000" and "1960" and substitute "\$33,000,000" and "1961", respectively.

(2) In subsection (b), which relates to contributions to the technical cooperation program of the Organization of American States, strike out "1960" and substitute "1961".

(c) In section 307, which relates to advances and grants, insert "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 307. ADVANCES AND GRANTS; CONTRACTS.—", and at the end thereof add the following:

"(b) The President shall arrange for a nongovernmental research group, university, or foundation to study the advisability and practicability of a program, to be known as the Point Four Youth Corps, under which young United States citizens would be trained and serve abroad in programs of technical cooperation. Not to exceed \$10,000 from funds made available pursuant to section 304 of this Act may be used to help defray the expenses of such a study."

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE AND OTHER PROGRAMS

Sec. 204. Title IV of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to special assistance and other programs, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 400(a), which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and "\$247,500,000" and substitute "1961" and "\$260,000,000", respectively.

(b) In section 401, which relates to the United Nations Emergency Force, strike out "1960" in the second sentence and substitute "1961".

(c) In section 402, which relates to earmarking of funds, strike out "1960" in the first sentence and substitute "1961".

(d) In section 403, which relates to responsibilities in Germany, strike out "1960" and "\$7,500,000" in the first sentence and substitute "1961" and "\$6,750,000", respectively.

(e) Insert after section 403 the following new section 404:

"SEC. 404. INDUS BASIN DEVELOPMENT.—The Congress of the United States welcomes the progress made through the good offices of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development toward the development of the Indus Basin through a program of cooperation among south Asian and other nations of the free world in order to promote economic growth and political stability in south Asia, and affirms the willingness of the United States, pursuant to authorities contained in this and other Acts, to participate in this significant undertaking. In the event that funds appropriated pursuant to this Act are made available to be used by or under the supervision of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development in furtherance of the foregoing purposes, such funds may be used in accordance with requirements, standards, or procedures established by the Bank concerning completion of plans and cost estimates and determination of feasibility, rather than with requirements, standards, or procedures concerning such matters set forth in this or other Acts; and such funds may also be used without regard to the provisions of section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1241), whenever the President determines that such provisions cannot be fully satisfied without seriously impeding or preventing accomplishment of such purposes."

(f) Amend section 405, which relates to migrants, refugees, and escapees, as follows:

(1) In subsection (c), which relates to contributions to the program of the United

Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, strike out "1960" and substitute "1961".

(2) In subsection (d), which relates to the continuation of activities undertaken for selected escapees, strike out "1960" and "\$5,200,000" and substitute "1961" and "\$3,500,000", respectively.

(g) In section 406, which relates to children's welfare, strike out "1960" and substitute "1961".

(h) In section 407, which relates to Palestine refugees in the Near East, strike out "1960" and "\$25,000,000" in the first sentence and substitute "1961" and "\$22,000,000", respectively; strike out the proviso in the first sentence; and insert after the first sentence the following new sentences: "After January 1, 1961, United States contributions shall not be used for programs of relief which heretofore have been administered on the basis of ration cards except for refugees whose need and eligibility for relief have been certified after July 1, 1960. The provisions of section 548, which relate to the availability of unexpended balances, shall not be applicable to unobligated balances of any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated pursuant to this section. The President shall include in his recommendations to the Congress for fiscal year 1962 programs under this Act specific recommendations with respect to a program for the progressive repatriation and resettlement of refugees and for reducing United States contributions to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East."

(i) Section 409, which relates to ocean freight charges, is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), after "such nations and areas" insert ", or, in the case of such nations and areas which are landlocked, transportation charges from the United States ports to designated points of entry in such nations and areas,".

(2) In subsection (c), strike out "1960" and "\$2,300,000" and substitute "1961" and "\$2,000,000", respectively.

(j) Amend section 411, which relates to administrative and other expenses, as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), which relates to certain expenses of administering nonmilitary assistance, strike out "1960" and "\$39,500,000" and substitute "1961" and "\$40,000,000", respectively.

(2) In subsection (c), which relates to administrative and other expenses of the Department of State, strike out "to" after "appropriated" and substitute "for expenses of".

(k) In section 419(a), which relates to atoms for peace, strike out "1960" and "\$6,500,000" and substitute "1961" and "\$3,400,000", respectively.

CHAPTER III—CONTINGENCY FUND

Sec. 301. Section 451(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to the President's special authority and contingency fund, is amended by striking out "1960" and "\$155,000,000" in the first sentence and substituting "1961" and "\$175,000,000", respectively.

CHAPTER IV—GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. Chapter IV of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to general and administrative provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 502, which relates to use of foreign currency, is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(c) Notwithstanding section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, or any other provision of law, if the President finds that participation by the United States in an internationally financed program to preserve the great cultural monuments of the Upper Nile would promote the foreign policy of the United States he may, subject to the approval of the Congress, use or enter

into agreements with friendly nations or organizations of nations to use, for this purpose, foreign currencies owned by the United States which have been generated under this Act or under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, in the countries in which the program is to be carried out, but the value of foreign currencies so used shall not exceed an amount equal to 33 1/2 per centum of the total cost of such program."

(b) Section 504(d), which relates to small machine tools and other industrial equipment, is repealed.

(c) In section 505(a), which relates to loan assistance and sales, insert after the first sentence the following new sentence: "Commodities, equipment, and materials transferred to the United States as repayment may be used for assistance authorized by this Act, other than title II of chapter II, in accordance with the provisions of this Act applicable to the furnishing of such assistance."

(d) In section 513, which relates to notice to legislative commodities, insert before ", and copies" in the last sentence the following: "and under the last clause of the second sentence of section 404".

(e) Amend section 523, which relates to coordination with foreign policy, by adding the following new subsection:

"(d) Whenever the Chief of the United States diplomatic mission in a country determines that the achievement of United States foreign policy objectives there requires it, he may issue regulations applicable to officers and employees of the United States Government and to contractors with the United States Government governing the extent to which their pay and allowances received and to be used in that country shall be paid in local currency. Notwithstanding any other law, United States Government agencies are authorized and directed to comply with such regulations."

(f) Amend section 527, which relates to employment of personnel, as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), which relates to employment of personnel in the United States, strike out "seventy" and "forty-five" in the first sentence and substitute "seventy-six" and "fifty-one", respectively.

(2) In subsection (c), which relates to employment of personnel outside the United States, strike out "Director" in the introductory clause and substitute "President"; and insert before the period at the end of paragraph (2) the following new proviso: "Provided further, That Foreign Service Reserve officers appointed, or assigned pursuant to this paragraph shall receive in-class promotions in accordance with such regulations as the President may prescribe".

(3) In subsection (d), which relates to appointment of alien employees outside the United States, strike out ", at the request of the Director".

(g) In section 534(a), which relates to reports, strike out "six months" in the first sentence and substitute "fiscal year".

(h) In section 537(a), which relates to provisions on uses of funds, amend paragraph (3) to read as follows: "(3) contracting with individuals for personal services abroad: *Provided*, That such individuals shall not be regarded as employees of the United States for the purpose of any law administered by the Civil Service Commission;"

(i) In section 537(c), which relates to construction or acquisition of facilities abroad, strike out "\$2,750,000" and substitute "\$4,250,000".

CHAPTER V—TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS REFLECTING NEW LIMITS OF UNITED STATES

SEC. 501. The Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 205(c), strike out "continental" in the twelfth clause of the first sentence.

(b) In section 411(d), strike out "the continental limits of".

(c) In section 527(c), strike out "the continental limits of" in the introductory clause.

(d) In section 527(d), strike out "the continental limits of".

(e) In section 530(a), strike out "the continental limits of".

(f) In section 537(a), strike out "continental" in the last proviso of paragraph (5) and in paragraphs (13) and (17); and strike out "the continental limits of" in paragraph (10).

CHAPTER VI—AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS

SEC. 601. The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1691 and the following) is amended as follows:

(a) In section 104, which relates to use of foreign currencies, strike out all following "Acts" where it first appears in the last proviso and insert a period.

(b) In section 202, which relates to transfers of surplus agricultural commodities on a grant basis, strike out "The" at the beginning thereof and substitute the following: "In order to facilitate the utilization of surplus agricultural commodities in meeting the requirements of needy peoples, and in order to promote economic development in underdeveloped areas in addition to that which can be accomplished under title I of this Act, the".

(c) In section 203, which relates to delivery of relief supplies, after the words "designated ports of entry abroad" insert ", or, in the case of landlocked countries, transportation from United States ports to designated points of entry abroad."

SEC. 602. Section 501(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 256), which relates to international cooperation in health, is repealed.

SEC. 603. Section 2 of Public Law 174, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended (22 U.S.C. 279a), which relates to United States membership in the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, is amended by inserting "such" before "sums" and striking out "not exceeding \$3,000,000."

SEC. 604. Section 3(a) of Public Law 403, Eightieth Congress, as amended (22 U.S.C. 280b), which relates to United States membership in the South Pacific Commission, is amended by striking out "\$75,000" and substituting "\$100,000".

SEC. 605. Title II of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1431), which relates to interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills, is amended by adding the following:

"ASSISTANCE TO STUDENTS FROM OTHER COUNTRIES

"Sec. 204. (a) With respect to students from other countries attending colleges or universities in the United States, under the provisions of this Act or under any other government, institution, or individual program which furthers the purposes of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to provide for counseling, orientation, supplementary English language training, and such other assistance as will help them to have a fruitful experience here consistent with the objectives of section 2.

"(b) Grants which are made to colleges and universities under this section shall be made in the discretion of the Secretary on the basis of specific programs submitted to him.

"(c) Institutions receiving such grants shall be obliged to contribute an equal amount to such program. No grant to an institution shall exceed \$100 per foreign student enrolled in the institution during the period of the grant. No part of such grant shall be payable to a foreign student. The

total amount of such grants shall not exceed \$1,000,000 in any fiscal year."

SEC. 606. The President shall have a study made of the functions of, and the degree of coordination among, agencies engaged in foreign economic activities, including the Department of State, the International Cooperation Administration, the Development Loan Fund, the Export-Import Bank, and the Department of Agriculture, with a view to simplifying and rationalizing the formulation and implementation of United States foreign economic policies. The President shall include in his presentation to the Congress of the fiscal year 1962 mutual security program his findings and recommendations resulting from such study.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader informs me that a Senator desires to offer an amendment to the mutual security bill, but that he will not be able to be here until about 5:30 this evening. I do not anticipate that we will have the third reading of the bill before 5:30, but I should like to have all Senators on notice that if the Senator is in the Chamber and offers his amendment, and if we can conclude with the bill and go to a third reading this evening, we would like to do so.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED COMMERCIAL AIR SHIPMENTS OF HOUSEHOLD GOODS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures I am in receipt of a "Review of Selected Commercial Air Shipments of Household Goods of Military Personnel" by the Comptroller General of the United States.

This audit review was forwarded by the Comptroller General of the United States, the Honorable Joseph Campbell, under a letter dated April 25, 1960.

I ask unanimous consent to have this letter from the Comptroller General published in the RECORD as part of these remarks, along with a copy of a statement by me relative to the review.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, April 25, 1960.

HON. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of
Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Congress
of the United States.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed for the use of your committee is a copy of our report to the Congress on review of selected commercial air shipments of household goods of military personnel.

The report discloses that unnecessary costs were incurred as a result of shipping household goods of transferred military personnel to and from oversea points by commercial air transportation. We found that air transportation was used in cases where adequate surface transportation was available at much lower cost. A review of 13 expensive shipments of household goods by commercial air at a total cost of \$125,470 disclosed that shipment by surface transportation was feasible and would have cost only about \$23,000 or about \$102,000 less than the cost of shipment by commercial air. For example, household goods were shipped by commercial air from Texas to Pakistan at a cost of \$14,830, whereas

they could have been shipped by surface transportation for only about \$1,750. In this instance, they would have arrived in Pakistan by ship one week earlier than by air. Also, we noted that air shipments included a piano, a model ship, and a sled. Such items are obviously not essential to the health or well-being of the transferred personnel or for the prevention of undue hardship. Where items are considered desirable rather than essential, we believe that shipment should be by surface transportation unless there are cogent reasons justifying air shipment.

We are recommending to the Secretary of Defense that specific instructions be incorporated into the Joint Travel Regulations limiting the use of commercial air for shipment of household goods.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,

Comptroller General of the United States.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The Comptroller General of the United States, Hon. Joseph Campbell, has advised me that military services have been shipping household goods of uniformed personnel overseas by commercial airline at a cost five times as great as charges for available and adequate surface transportation.

The Comptroller General's statement was based on audit of 13 sample Army and Air Force cases in which commercial air transportation charges totaled \$125,470 as compared with surface transportation costs which would have totaled \$22,984 if that means of transportation had been used.

In one case the Comptroller General found that a \$14,830 commercial air transport shipment from Fort Sam Houston, Tex., to Karachi, Pakistan, could have been sent by surface transport for \$1,750, and that it would have arrived a week earlier.

The cost of these 13 shipments of household goods ranged from \$2,700 to \$21,700 each. And in the course of the audits the Comptroller General found that the Government had been charged \$48,979.19 for one \$5,216.19 shipment and the Army disbursing officer's arithmetic had not caught the error.

This overpayment case involved the shipment of 2,947 pounds of household goods originating in Vancouver Barracks, Wash., U.S.A., by commercial air transportation from Portland, Oreg., to New York via Flying Tiger Airlines, Inc.; from New York to London via Pan American Airways; from London to Khartoum, Sudan, via Hunting Clan Air Transport, Inc.; and from Khartoum to Asmara, Eritrea, and via Sudan Airways. The Comptroller General is seeking to recover the \$43,763 overpayment from Sudan Airways.

Although itemized listings of the air shipments were not generally available, the audits did disclose nonessential shipments by commercial air freight, such as a sled to France in the month of May, a piano to Spain, and a model ship from France to the United States.

The Comptroller General could find no reason to regard shipment of such items at premium rates as essential to the health and well-being of transferred personnel, and asserted the belief "that shipment should be by less expensive surface transportation unless there are cogent reasons, which are fully documented, justifying air shipment."

A copy of the Comptroller General's audit review of these cases was forwarded to me today as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and I shall take the matter up with the Senate Armed Services Committee.

The report points out that under military regulations and the Career Compensation Act of 1949, "household effects of members of the uniformed services may be shipped without regard to the comparative costs of the

various modes of transportation," and under present practice determination is made by the local military transportation officers.

AID FOR THE ELDERLY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Midwest Democratic Conference held recently in Detroit adopted an excellent statement on the welfare of elderly people. This statement was sponsored by Mrs. Geri Joseph, chairwoman of the Democratic Farmer Labor Party in Minnesota. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

GOALS FOR AMERICA—POLICY STATEMENT, DEMOCRATIC MIDWEST CONFERENCE, DETROIT, MICH., MARCH 26, 1960

HUMAN WELFARE: AGING

The Democratic Party has a long record of achievements in aiding older citizens of the United States, particularly since the passage of the Social Security Act of 1935. Now the problems of the elderly are assuming new forms, and we recognize the leadership of Senators McNAMARA and HILL, Representatives FOGARTY, FORAND, and WIER, in seeking to provide legislation that will help solve these problems.

There are about 16 million Americans over the age of 65 years, 9 percent of the population, and this number is mounting both absolutely and relative to the total population. An increasing proportion of elderly persons are physically vigorous as they enter old age. At the same time, medical advances have all but wiped out the acute, infectious diseases as causes of death. When elderly persons become seriously ill today, they are increasingly likely to acquire one of the chronic illnesses—mainly diseases of the heart or the arteries, cancer, or mental illness. A great need here is for preventive and diagnostic health services.

Once acquired, the chronic illnesses require long periods of hospitalization or home nursing care. Thus, they require relatively heavy expenditures to treat and to maintain the patient while under treatment, whereas the older infectious diseases formerly carried off their victims with relatively few costs for medical care. Few older persons have accumulated savings sufficient to pay for their treatment and care if they get one of the chronic diseases, their current income is generally very low if they are retired, and the costs of medical care are mounting. To avoid placing half the population of older persons on even more costly old age assistance, the principal of compulsory insurance from the earliest working years—through the social security system—is the only sensible solution.

Due to increasing geographical mobility caused by the requirements of modern industry, and to the contemporary popularity of the smaller sized residence, adult offspring of today are much less likely than formerly able to move into their parents' home or to have space for their parents in their own apartments or homes. Thus, more and more, older persons or couples are required to live by themselves. Thus, they are less likely to be cared for personally by their adult children when they become ill, and it costs more to have others care for them. There is a growing need for nursing homes, convalescent homes, and chronic illness wards in hospitals.

The traditional manner of caring for seriously ill persons is to place them in hospitals. But many chronically ill elderly persons do not need the extensive and expensive

care provided by hospitals. Similarly, the traditional manner of caring for indigent aged persons who cannot fully take care of themselves is to put them in institutions—"old people's homes." Recent studies have shown that cheaper and more effective care can be provided in the older person's own home, if part-time homemakers' and nursing services can be provided.

Architects and other constructors of houses have learned about the special housing needs of older persons: handrails, substitution of graded ramps for steps, bathtubs that are easy to get in and out of, and so on. Studies of the social needs of older people show that they do best when they live with other older people in independent units with certain common facilities, but not completely isolated from younger people. Both public and private housing constructors long neglected the physical and social requirements of older people, and so there is a great need today for the stimulation of construction that will take into account these needs.

The increasing likelihood today that persons reaching the age of 65 will be physically fit and vigorous means that there is less reason for retirement from jobs at that age. Compulsory retirement policies now in existence often reflect the earlier situation. There still may be good reason today for some people to retire at 65 years, but there is little reason why the retirement should be compulsory for all people. Government can do little about this, except for its own employees, of course, but the social security system should avoid penalizing people who want to work after the age of 65 and are better off doing so.

Another carryover from the past is the widespread belief that older persons are not efficient or are otherwise not desirable as workers. This belief encompasses workers from the age of 40 onward, and not only those past 65 years. Studies show that, for most lines of work, older workers are fully as capable as younger workers, and that in matters of responsibility and stability on the job are often more desirable. Laws for the protection of older workers generally are actions for the States rather than for the Federal Government. On the other hand, the Federal Government does use Executive orders to prohibit discrimination by employers with Federal contracts and subcontracts, and orders could be extended to prohibit discrimination against older workers by such employers. If the Executive fails to issue such an order, Congress can require nondiscrimination by statute.

Some of the unemployment among older people today is due to technological displacement, largely due to automation, and this will be increasingly significant in the near future. It often pays industries to retrain their younger workers for the new jobs required by automated production, and some younger workers will find it advantageous to get the new training at their own expense. But the expense of retraining can seem prohibitive, either to the employer or to the older worker, when the worker has only 10-20 more years for the job. Unless the Government helps to provide retraining, especially for jobs that younger workers are less likely to go into, industrial workers will increasingly find themselves on the occupational rubbish heap at the age of 45 or 50.

The Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, headed by Senator McNAMARA, of Michigan, has discovered that there are critical shortages of trained labor in the area of health and community services, jobs in which older part-time workers would be especially suitable if they were properly selected and trained. At present, there are practically no vocational training programs for persons over 65 years, and the labor shortages in these special fields con-

tinue because there is no recruiting and training programs to meet their needs.

The McNamara subcommittee finds that at least half of the older people in the country today do not have enough income to afford decent housing, proper nutrition, adequate medical care, or necessary recreation. Clearly, there is need for a rise in the payments under old-age insurance and old-age assistance, and if inflation continues, a system of maintaining a constant purchasing power for these payments.

Modern life also tends to create social isolation for older persons. Geographic mobility, urban anonymity, the decline of the extended family system (in which relatives kept close touch with each other), all tend to make it less likely that older people will be acquainted with other people of similar age and interests. Further, the concentration on work in past generations to the relative exclusion of hobbies and social participation make many older people, especially those in the lower income classes, less prepared to participate in constructive leisure time activities when they are retired. Many private associations around the country—led by older persons or by younger ones—have recognized the problem and have developed numerous Senior Citizens Clubs, Golden Age Clubs, and the like. Still, only a small proportion of the elderly have been reached, and these mainly in large cities, while the great bulk of those over 65 years remain lonely and at a loss as to what to do with their leisure time. A demonstration project in five rural counties of Minnesota shows what a magnificent response whole communities show when a trained community organizer helps them to start recreational, housing, and educational programs for the aging. Such projects ought to be stimulated in all the States, on a temporary basis until the local communities and organizations become aware of the problem and know what concretely to do about it, and the Federal Government could provide short-term grants for this purpose, the total cost of which would be quite low.

There is evidence that a growing number of Americans, old and young alike, are becoming aware of the widespread character of these new or expanded problems facing the aging and are in favor of doing something about them. Not all the problems can be solved, and even some of those that can be solved will require the actions of individuals and private groups. But Government has an important role to play, and the Democratic Party has an obligation to formulate and support recommendations for legislative and administrative action to ease the plight of the 16 million citizens over 65 years and the 49 million over 45 years.

To help meet the needs of the older population, the Democratic advisory council (in a policy statement adopted December 6, 1959), recommended:

1. A substantial increase in social security benefits, with at least a 30-percent increase over the current minimum payment of \$33 a month.

2. Provision, through the social security system, of benefits to cover the increasing costs of adequate health care for retired beneficiaries and eligible dependents.

3. Revision of the OASI "retirement test" to allow part-time work to supplement regular OASI benefits up to an amount necessary to maintain a decent standard of living.

4. The blanketing into the social security system of all persons in covered occupations who are already retired.

5. The outlawing of age discrimination in employment in all Federal contracts.

6. Expansion of public preventive health programs to all persons over 60.

7. Appropriation and use of the full amount authorized by the Housing Act of 1959 for housing for the elderly, and a continuing program of construction stimulated by the Federal Government.

8. Creation of an older persons office in the executive branch.

The McNamara committee has formulated additional recommendations:

1. The establishment of a senior citizens service training program for the purpose of recruiting and training willing and able older persons to serve in specified community activities, the personnel for which are otherwise in short supply.

2. It recommends that the Congress consider adoption of a program of financial assistance to nursing homes which meet the minimum standards for medical and restorative services. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should be requested to develop a suggested plan and formula for this assistance program.

To this list, the Midwest Democratic Conference would add the following recommendations for action by the Federal Government:

1. Making funds available to the States, to be matched by funds provided by the States, for the purpose of hiring persons trained in community organization, whose task it would be to work with community groups and voluntary associations to stimulate local recreational, educational, and welfare programs for the benefit of the aging.

2. Making funds available to the States, to be matched by funds provided by the States, for the purpose of encouraging the States to develop specific demonstration projects for the benefit of the aging. Such demonstration projects—to be approved by appropriate units of the Federal Government—might include such things as surveys of the needs of the aging, geriatrics clinics, model housing for elderly persons with low income, model nursing homes for incapacitated elderly persons, homemaker and household services, local recreational and education facilities.

3. Explore ways of providing occupational retraining for workers 40-65 years of age displaced by automation and other innovations.

THE DULUTH HARBOR—A SOUND INVESTMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most exciting and important economic developments in the State of Minnesota is the progress of the port of Duluth in preparing its facilities to make use of the great St. Lawrence Seaway.

A very fine article discussing this effort appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune of April 10, 1960, an article by Richard Saunders of the Minneapolis Tribune staff.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article by Mr. Saunders.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Apr. 10, 1960]

DULUTH AWAITS NEXT ROUND IN BATTLE TO BE WORLD PORT—TAXPAYERS' INVESTMENT AT STAKE

(By Richard Saunders)

DULUTH, MINN.—Scrawled on a blackboard in Supt. Anthony F. Rice's office in the sprawling public marine terminal on Rice's Point are three chalked notes. They read:

"Trans-Michigan—Due April 24.

"Trans-Erie—May 24.

"Clemens Sartori—May 1."

These are the tentative arrival dates of the first three foreign ships carrying general cargo that are scheduled to call at Duluth-Superior in 1960, the second season of ocean shipping through the deepened St. Lawrence Seaway.

The number of regular visits by these and other freighters like them in the next few years will go far to determine the outcome of valiant battle being waged to establish this harbor as a major center of world commerce.

Every taxpaying Minnesotan has a stake in the final result, because the \$10 million Arthur M. Clure terminal was built with State, county, and city funds.

From the seaway port authority of Duluth's ninth floor headquarters in the Alworth Building, the battle lines extend westward to the Pacific coast, south to the gulf coast and eastward through Washington and New York to Europe and the Middle East.

The authority's aim: to knock down the barriers of decades-old shipping habits, discriminatory rates, and practices and ignorance that block the development of this infant seaport located 1,500 miles from the sea.

"We're making slow but steady progress," said Robert Tomich, port traffic manager, last week. "But this is a tremendous task and we still have a long way to go."

In its baptismal year, the twin ports exported 86 million bushels of grain and imported or exported 17,000 tons of general cargo. This was twice as much grain and one-third as much cargo as predicted before the season opened.

Optimism was running high in shipping circles last week that grain exports in 1960 will rise to between 100 and 150 million bushels and that packaged freight will hit the 1959 estimate of 50,000 tons.

"By any standard, a tripling in general cargo shipments in 1 year would be an outstanding achievement," another port spokesman declared.

Last year, 22 foreign freighters put in here, bringing 11,681 tons of steel, ferro-silicon, machinery, woodpulp, glass, coffee, twine, liquor, beer, rugs, automobiles, and oatmeal to upper Midwest customers.

They departed with 4,700 tons of bentonite clay, machinery, dried milk, flour, honey, and tinplate, destined mainly for northern Europe.

The export tonnage was a far cry from the 750,000 tons of goods which, surveys indicate, move overseas through Lake Michigan, gulf and Atlantic ports from Duluth-Superior's 11-State trade area in an 8-month season.

Much of this total could move through Duluth at savings of 40 to 50 cents a hundred pounds over Milwaukee and Chicago," explained Tomich.

Robert T. Smith, port director, Tomich and others have worked all winter to correct the eight chief inequities they feel keep Duluth at a disadvantage. The box score: two down and six to go.

In February three of the eight railroads serving the port—the Milwaukee Road, Chicago and North Western and Soo Line—agreed to raise from 2 to 7 days the free time the railroads will allow cars to stand without charge to the shipper.

The other roads are objecting because they don't want to tie up grain cars during the harvest season.

The second victory came when the railroads agreed to eliminate a ruling that favored west bank Lake Michigan ports in the absorption of car loading and unloading costs.

Still to be won, however, are skirmishes over land transportation rates which now favor coastal ports against inland ports, Government discrimination against lake ports in routing Federal aid exports of agricultural products, the Maritime Commission's refusals to include Duluth as a regular port of call in all subsidy contracts with American lines and over an arbitrary 10-cent-a-ton penalty levied by conference line ships on general cargo carried on Lake Superior.

The port says it has received inquiries or requests for terminal charges of fruit, meat, and dairy products, lumber products, lubricating oils, machinery, seeds, peas, potatoes, bagged flour, vegetable oils, and meal for export in 1960.

But, no matter how great the saving, none of these shipments will move through the twin ports unless the shipper can be guaranteed quick and efficient service to the destination point.

On the other hand, no shipowner will spend an extra \$600 to \$1,200 a day (in the case of a foreign vessel) to come to Duluth and find no cargo waiting for him.

Well aware of this dilemma, the port and the Minneapolis Area Chamber of Commerce have been conducting a winter-long Operation General Cargo campaign to induce area shippers to try the twin ports.

Meanwhile, the port authority and shipping agents are seeking to arrange regular monthly sailings by five foreign lines serving the United Kingdom, northern Europe, the Mediterranean, the Caribbean, and South America.

As of last week, regular sailing schedules had been issued by the German Poseidon Lines, the port's lone steady service last year, and the English Manchester Liners, Ltd.

A third previously announced service, by the Greek Hellenic Lines, had not been firmed up.

Two other foreign companies that sent ships on an "if traffic justifies" basis last year may return this year under the same conditions, Tomich said. This includes Hamburg-Chicago Lines, whose *Clemens Sartori* is due to arrive May 1 with 300 tons of baling twine, glassware, and iron, and Bristol City Liners.

The *Trans-Michigan* and the *Trans-Erie* are Poseidon vessels.

The two American ship lines which attempted to establish Great Lakes service last year lost a total of \$1,500,000 in the process. Tomich does not expect to see Grace Line or American Export Lines in Lake Superior this year.

(The international shipping season on the seaway is expected to open April 15 if ice conditions permit, 3 days earlier than in 1959. The first foreign vessel, a grain ship, is due in Duluth-Superior April 21, 2 weeks ahead of the *Ramon de Larrinaga's* May 3 arrival last year.)

Meanwhile, the port has been bustling with activity in anticipation of increasing the estimated \$2 million windfall of wages, purchases, and services left here in connection with the introduction of foreign commerce last year.

To speed grain handling, at least four of the port's 11 elevators and grain docks are being improved at a cost of more than \$1 million. This comes on top of the \$2½ million spent on dredging, spout raising and improved berthing areas in 1959.

Grain storage capacity has been increased to 70 million bushels with the conversion of a former Carnegie anthracite coal storage building into a 2½-million-bushel grain warehouse by Duluth Dock & Transport Co. The new firm has also built a warehouse to store 20,000 tons of salt.

Donovan Construction Co., St. Paul, has acquired a 45-acre site on Connor's Point in Superior for the possible construction of a grain elevator.

International Duluth Seaport Corp., a group of Canadian and English investors who have proposed an \$80 to \$100 million private terminal on a 135-acre site, expects to gain clear title to the property in 20 or 30 days, a spokesman said.

The corporation plans a board meeting in Duluth in early May to plan its next step.

The port authority is considering construction of a \$400,000 5,000-ton tank farm for storing animal and vegetable fats, oils and greases.

Cargill, Inc., which has a 2,400,000-bushel grain elevator in Superior, is negotiating to operate the 4-million bushel Norris Grain Co. elevators in Duluth.

The Fraser-Nelson shipyard in Superior, booming all winter with major repairs on several domestic iron ore carriers, may find repeat business during the summer from foreign hulls damaged during trips through the lakes en route to the twin ports.

At least two new steamship agencies and three new stevedoring companies have opened offices in Duluth, increasing the former total to eight and the latter to 14.

The Minnesota State grain inspector's office will add 25 more men to its 100-man staff to handle an expected increase in grain shipments. One Federal and one State entomologist will be employed to inspect cargo holds for insects.

The Federal Immigration and Naturalization Service and the U.S. Collector's Office have hired three additional men.

Several new harbor services are planned, including a water taxi to ferry pilots and inspectors out to foreign vessels anchored offshore, a garbage collection boat and a third excursion ship for sightseers.

Steamship agencies, busy lining up ships to pick up grain stored in the port's 11 elevators, report charters are running slightly behind to about even with last year's record-breaking rate.

Agents hunting for packaged cargo, their job immeasurably more difficult because of tradition-bound shippers' habits and unsettled freight rates, are generally optimistic.

One of the new agents, Brendan P. O'Callahan, New York, said he has "firm commitments on 200 to 300 tons of general cargo for export" from May 1 to October 1 and has "tentative commitments on 20,000 to 30,000 additional tons."

O'Callahan, who brands the Duluth facilities as "the most flexible of any of the 250 world ports I've seen in 26 years in the shipping business," is confident the harbor will become a major foreign trade center in 3 to 5 years.

But he echoes a belief widely held in shipping circles here that that day will not come until the port gets wider support from upper Midwest shippers and the public.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE COOPERATION TO SOLVE THE REFUGEE PROBLEM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is the great strength of our American assistance operations abroad that they are a practical combination of public and private assistance. The direct generosity of individual Americans to those who are hungry and homeless in other nations amounts to millions of dollars a year channeled through more than 35 voluntary agencies.

The esteemed Monsignor Edward E. Swanstrom, chairman of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, and himself director of Catholic Relief Services, has called attention in a statement signed by the council's executive committee to the special obligations of our Nation for both public and private efforts in World Refugee Year.

The council comments that "the voluntary agencies take pride in the spirit which has prevailed—note the results—and are challenged by the vast area of critical needs still to be met."

Among these needs the council asks full use by the administration of the \$10 million World Refugee Year Fund

authorization and refugee admission legislation providing for admission of certain "difficult to resettle" persons. Both these proposals are goals which I wholeheartedly endorse.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Monsignor Swanstrom and the members of the council executive committee and the council's statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF VOLUNTARY AGENCIES FOR FOREIGN SERVICE, INC.,
New York, N.Y., April 22, 1960.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
The Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service has expressed the belief that you will be interested to receive the attached statement "The Refugee Problem—Concerning Both Sectors, the Public and the Private."

On behalf of the American Council the officers appreciate this opportunity to transmit this report to you for your information and for such use as you see fit.

Moses A. Leavitt, honorary chairman, American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, Inc.

The Right Reverend Monsignor Edward E. Swanstrom, chairman, Catholic Relief Services—National Catholic Welfare Conference, Inc.

Vice chairmen: Dr. John S. Badeau, Near East Foundation; J. N. Byler, Mennonite Central Committee, Inc.; Bernard A. Confer, Luther World Relief, Inc.; Richard W. Reuter, Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere, Inc. (CARE); Louis W. Schneider, American Friends Service Committee, Inc.; Dr. R. Norris Wilson, Church World Service, Inc.

James P. Rice, secretary, United Hias Service, Inc.

Abram G. Becker, treasurer, Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere, Inc. (CARE).

Sincerely yours,
EDWARD E. SWANSTROM,
Chairman.

THE REFUGEE PROBLEM CONCERNING BOTH SECTORS—THE PUBLIC AND THE PRIVATE

A short time ago the member agencies of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service undertook a review of their operational activities in the area of need and underprivilege abroad. Their findings are summarized in a formal statement delivered before the Straus committee¹ engaged in a study of the role of the American private sector abroad. In conclusion the statement expresses a concern of the 39-member agencies of the American Council, as follows:

"During the 20th century it is impossible to escape from the fact that there exists a struggle for the minds and souls of men. This struggle may be conducted by words and by every means of propaganda, and it may also be conducted by deeds and by example. The voluntary sector, besides promoting peace and an abiding sense of brotherhood through programs of cooperation to meet human need, performs a basic service to truth which is deeply significant to the whole future development and ultimate goals of American foreign policy.

"The American voluntary agencies have been particularly active in mass and indi-

¹ Javits amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1958, sec. 205(j)(2).

vidual migration and resettlement of peoples displaced by war's aftermath, calamity or political oppression. In the past decade, some 600,000 such persons have been resettled in the United States of America through sponsorship secured by voluntary agencies. The American economy was aided, but the resettlement movement was not a device to satisfy the labor market; it was a human response to human need—with great social and economic advantage to the labor market. This corporate work of rescue has not only saved individual and family lives, but has been of service to the economy of such overpopulated countries as Austria and Italy. Postwar sponsored migration has demonstrated the continuing awareness of America as a haven for the oppressed and has thus supported and dramatized the position of the United States in the world. But even more, this activity of the American voluntary agencies has inspired and become an integral part of worldwide endeavor of counterpart agencies thus adding immeasurably to the total achievement of the American voluntary agencies. A number of worldwide voluntary associations have helped to resettle substantial numbers of persons in other countries as well as in the United States of America. These world programs for refugees relying substantially for financial support on voluntary American gifts, are a vital part of the contribution that American voluntary agencies are making to the broader goals of our foreign policy."

No one familiar with the needs of refugees can fail to recognize the American leadership which has been exerted since the end of World War II. Indeed the determination to express our humanitarian concern is reflected in continued American private and governmental action, even as the aspect of the refugee problem has changed with the passage of 15 years of postwar history.

These 15 years have brought action through a variety of concerned organizations—governmental, such as the Displaced Persons Commission and the U.S. escapee program; intergovernmental, such as the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration; international, such as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, the International Refugee Organization, the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees, and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees; and private, voluntary organizations sectarian and nonsectarian such as those which constitute the membership of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies.

Through a series of legislative enactments pertaining to immigration and laws relating to the uses of American agricultural products and through the development of specific programs and organizations, the historic concern of the American people for others has been demonstrated. Through the joint action of the public and private sectors millions have been fed and clothed. The movement of many hundreds of thousands of displaced persons throughout the free world by the International Refugee Organization was facilitated by American governmental support and voluntary agency ability to arrange necessary sponsorship and to accept placement responsibilities. Since 1952, through a series of bilateral contracts and cooperative arrangements, the voluntary agencies have made operational and other resources available to the important programs of the existing governmental, intergovernmental, and international organizations. The voluntary agencies take pride in the spirit which has prevailed; we note the results and we are challenged by the vast area of critical needs still to be met.

Currently appealing to their constituencies throughout the country, during World

Refugee Year, voluntary agencies, members of the American Council, deeply concerned with refugee needs seek a goal well over the amounts annually subscribed in campaigns of previous years; the target approximates \$65 million and indicates a \$15 million increase over the average annual expenditures of \$50 million for refugee services since the year 1945.

In keeping with a basic policy of the American private effort, voluntarily contributed funds are expended for assistance to refugees directly by the agencies themselves and/or through cooperating voluntary agencies in oversea countries. It is important to note, therefore, that these funds do not appear as part of any governmental, intergovernmental, or international income record as is the practice in some countries where voluntary contributions are sought by public, tax-supported bodies.

The American Council is acutely aware of a vast additional resource that can never be fully measured. Through the uncounted contributed hours of unnamed volunteers serving member agencies across the breadth of our land, many thousands of uprooted human beings have felt the impact of an American ideal and again found friends, home life and independence. Hundreds of thousands of tons of serviceable used clothing and other supplies, collected for distribution wherever there was need, are yet another evidence that our people are a compassionate people and generous. The agencies gratefully acknowledge the vast and diversified contributions of their constituents. Theirs is a role that is not and can never be reflected in simple statistics.

The American Council of Voluntary Agencies has deep concern regarding the importance of a strong support by our Government of the World Refugee Year effort. Aware that Congress recommended the sum of \$10 million from the President's Emergency Fund for this purpose, it is hoped that our Government will take full advantage of this. Legislation for refugee immigration to the United States including provision for a proportion of the "difficult to resettle" persons as our share of the responsibility is a move toward solution of this problem, has been recommended by the agencies of the council, aware as they are of the endeavors of other countries in this respect and convinced of this country's capacity to constructively absorb such persons.

It is generally recognized that the refugee problems are too vast and the condition too fluid to be solved in a single World Refugee Year. On the other hand, the concentrated focus of a community of nations on this global problem is fraught with unlimited importance.

We acknowledge with satisfaction the continuing American governmental support of the U.S. escapee program, the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees, recognizing it as essential to the successful resolution of the refugee problem. We are convinced that American concern can be best expressed through the teamwork of the public and voluntary sectors. Firm in this resolve we must so act as to assure that no future historian will refer to the years of our time as "the century of the homeless man."

ARMED FORCES CHESS TOURNAMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am extremely pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues a notable event scheduled in the city of Washington during Armed Forces Week, May 15 to 20—the final chess tournament, the first

of its kind and the first in an annual series, in which outstanding chess players from the armed services of the United States, will meet to play for the chess championship of the U.S. armed services.

The 12 servicemen who have emerged from preliminary competition, and have the distinction to compete in the national chess tournament are the following:

Edmund Czapski, major U.S. Air Force, Lincoln Air Force Base, Nebr.

Arthur W. Feuerstein, private, first class, U.S. Army, Seine Area Command, France.

Henry A. Giertych, Jr., captain, U.S. Air Force, Keesler Air Force Base, Miss.

Robert D. Grande, technical sergeant, U.S. Air Force, Bolling Air Force Base, District of Columbia.

John A. Hudson, first lieutenant, U.S. Air Force, Chennault Air Force Base, La.

George Krauss, Jr., staff sergeant, U.S. Air Force, Forbes Air Force Base, Kans.

Peter A. C. Leuthold, airman, first class, U.S. Air Force, Sembach Air Force Base, Germany.

Richard C. Moran, airman, first class, U.S. Air Force, Dreux Air Force Base, France.

Charles D. Mott, captain, U.S. Navy, Bureau of Naval Weapons, District of Columbia.

Michael N. Robinson, specialist, fourth class, U.S. Army, Fort Gordon, Ga.

Eugene Sobczyk, commander, U.S. Navy, Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Wash.

Robert W. Walker, airman, third class, U.S. Air Force, Lowry Air Force Base, Colo.

This tournament does credit to the educational program of a national organization, the American Chess Foundation, and to the admirable administrative leadership of the Department of Defense.

The American Chess Foundation has the objective of encouraging the playing of chess as a national sport and past-time for young and old; to develop the many possibilities of chess for the intellectual and scientific training on which American security and prosperity depend; and to cultivate a climate of public opinion and a widespread knowledge of the game, out of which there can emerge chess masters, capable as in the past of providing United States of America leadership in the international chess field. I wish to commend and encourage the officers and directors of the foundation in this worthy endeavor. Its officers and directors are:

Walter J. Fried, president.

Rosser Reeves, chairman of the board.

Thomas Emery, honorary chairman, committee of sponsors.

Jacques Coe, vice president.

Morris J. Kasper, treasurer.

Cecile B. Wertheim, secretary.

Cleveland Amory.

Mrs. Benjamin Kaplan.

Walter Liebman.

Lessing J. Rosenwald.

Edward W. Turner.

Sidney Wallach.

The Department of Defense, recognizing the importance of intellectual and cultural achievement of our military

personnel, cooperated fully in making it possible for thousands of men and women in the armed services to participate in area competitions.

United Service Organizations and member agencies also cooperated in bringing about the successful planning of this program.

The individual who started the ball rolling, Mr. Thomas Emery, of New York, a former marine and distinguished chess player of international reputation, set up the initial endowment through the American Chess Foundation to provide annual prizes for 12 competition finalists and an annual trophy for the service to which the winner belongs.

But I understand the competition could not have succeeded without the enthusiastic efforts of a special committee here in Washington headed by Col. John D. Matheson, retired, of Arlington, Va., and consisting of Col. E. B. Ely, Mr. Sidney Wallach, Dr. Eliot Hearst, Mr. I. S. Turover, Mr. Thomas Emery, and Sgt. Bob Karch.

Chess, although an ancient game, is still enthralling and is enjoyed and widely recognized abroad as a peaceable and stimulating intellectual pastime. I have long advocated educational projects calculated to stir the interest of Americans in intellectual and cultural pursuits, and I believe the playing of chess fits into this classification. It may even be considered a standard of appraisal of a nation's intellectual and cultural dispositions and achievements. I would like to see this view reciprocated in this country.

Some 20 years ago the United States was recognized internationally for its supremacy in chess, but other countries have since forged ahead, notably the U.S.S.R. This happened not because our people are less capable or less intellectually inclined, but rather because these countries through resources of finance and of public opinion, deliberately encouraged wide chess play and corresponding chess superiority. Since my visit to the Soviet Union, where chess playing is a highly honored activity, I have become more convinced than ever that we must stimulate greater interest and participation in this type of program in the United States.

We live in a time when training in logical and imaginative thinking is indispensable to our national survival and to our continuing prosperity. Chess can have an important role in such training, and at the same time offer valuable social benefits. It belongs in our guidance programs for youth, and in the social programs of our retired citizens as a gratifying activity. The game is an excellent means to channel public attention from socially destructive pursuits, by filling a void in available leisure time projects.

The support of American industrial leadership of this program of the American Chess Foundation, New York, a non-profit group, would be a most productive and appropriate prospect.

I hope that the Congress will join me in this call to popularize and reward ability in chess among Americans for their own greater satisfaction and mental development, and for enhanced

international appreciation of our intellectual and cultural potentials in all areas of human interest. It could well be that from among our chess experts we would find an important reserve of strategic and diplomatic protagonists for the international matches, which in this age of negotiation are a vital and much-used tool in the handling of crises, whether on national levels or on a person-to-person basis. Such equipment would, of course, increase our confidence and effectiveness in a wider variety of social, business, and political encounters with others, be they friend or foe.

RESALE OF CERTAIN VESSELS TO REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8042) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to resell four C1-SAY-1 type vessels to the Government of the Republic of China for use in Chinese trade in Far East and Near East waters exclusively, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL conferees on the part of the Senate.

POLICY STATEMENT BY MIDWEST DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the policy statement adopted by the Midwest Democratic Conference at its recent meeting in Detroit, Mich., is a pledge to vigorous leadership on several national issues.

The civil rights section was introduced and sponsored by Mrs. Geri Joseph, State chairwoman of the DFL party of Minnesota. It affirms the determination of midwestern Democrats to support action by the Federal Government to secure the civil rights of all citizens, and it singles out six areas in which Federal action is needed. I ask unanimous consent that the section on civil rights be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the section on civil rights was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOALS FOR AMERICA—POLICY STATEMENT, DEMOCRATIC MIDWEST CONFERENCE, DETROIT, MICH., MARCH 26, 1960

CIVIL RIGHTS

It is the clear responsibility of the Federal Government to secure full civil rights to all Americans. We believe that the protection of civil rights is a constitutional mandate and it is the duty of the President and the Congress to guarantee observance. The right to vote; to the equal protection of the law; to publicly protest grievances; to the security of the person, papers, and property, and freedom of assembly are among the attributes of individual citizenship that

transcend State boundaries and that are not to be eroded or abridged by local custom or usage. At no time in our history has there been a more crucial need for the free exercise of these constitutional liberties by every American. Each level of government has this obligation in its own field of operation. Many civil rights problems require combined Federal, State, and local action for their effective solution. Any proper concept of States rights includes the imperative of States' responsibilities. Failure of any State to assume these responsibilities creates a mandate for Federal action.

In pursuing these goals we pledge the full use of the power and prestige of the executive branch of Government and of the Congress to uphold the Supreme Court and to:

1. Provide effective guarantees of the right to vote in local, State, and Federal elections.
2. Complete desegregation of public schools and all other tax-supported public facilities.
3. Eliminate discrimination in housing because of race, religion, or national origin.
4. Eliminate discrimination in employment opportunities and promotions.
5. Secure to all persons equal and non-segregated access to commercial places of public accommodation.
6. Authorize the Attorney General to secure injunctions against any infringement or deprivation of constitutional rights on account of race, religion, or national origin.

Recent Democratic administrations initiated measures removing discrimination against racial, religious, and other national minorities. The Executive Order of 1941 established the Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission; the 1946 Executive Order created the Commission on Equality in the Armed Forces from which flowed the Executive Order of 1947 eliminating segregation in the Armed Forces; the Executive Order of 1947 establishing the Civil Rights Commission brought forth the historic blueprint "to secure these rights" on which has rested all subsequent civil rights advances.

Contrasted with these achievements the succeeding Republican President has resisted the use of his office to eliminate such discrimination, has questioned the constitutionality of measures advanced to achieve that purpose and has refused to invoke the authority of his office and that of the Attorney General to advance the school and other desegregation mandates of the Supreme Court.

We pledge to use every influence—moral, educational, and political—to eliminate under law all barriers to the individual enjoyment of all civil rights so that the dignity of citizenship shall become a reality in fact as well as in law. We recognize that this task requires forthright action in all sections of the Nation.

We pledge our Democratic Party to encourage the participation of all citizens throughout the party structure.

CONDITION OF MIGRATORY FARMWORKERS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the condition of migratory farmworkers has long been one of the most serious problems in American life. They represent the most neglected and underprivileged group in American society, and the distance is increasing between their depressed standard of living and income and that of other groups in the Nation.

A. H. Raskin, writing in the New York Times magazine—April 24, 1960—has made a realistic summary of their problems and suggested some of the measures needed to improve their condition. As he states, these citizens are the "dis-

possessed ones." They do not have the elementary necessities which we assume to be part of the American way of life. Adequate housing, diet, medical attention, educational opportunity, and economic security—none of these are within reach of migratory workers.

Mr. President, the standard of living and wages of domestic migratory workers is related to the program of bringing in nearly 500,000 nationals from other nations for work on our big commercial farms. Congress should, I believe, consider most carefully the relationship between this program and the depressed condition of domestic migratory workers before any steps are taken to extend Public Law 78.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Raskin's article, "For 500,000—Still 'Tobacco Road,'" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 24, 1960]
FOR 500,000—STILL "TOBACCO ROAD"

(By A. H. Raskin)

Bedraggled caravans are rumbling north from Florida, from Texas and from southern California. They carry the landless army of workers on the land—the half-million migratory farm laborers who harvest much of the Nation's food, yet are so completely outside the protection of laws enacted to guarantee a modicum of security for all other wage earners that they have become known as the "excluded" Americans.

"I been everywhere, and I got nowhere" is the migrant's lament. He follows the sun and the crops, an indigent in an affluent society. He travels over highways lined with deluxe motels, their neon signs boasting of good food and television in every room. But journey's end for him is likely to be a tarpaper shack, a chicken coop, a tent or a dilapidated barn.

He tends the rich soil, helping to produce such plenty that the Government pays his employers to stop planting, or buys their oversupply to swell Uncle Sam's hoard of surplus crops. Yet the migrant and his family are undernourished—a factor that contributes to making their disease rate double that of citizens with higher incomes and more stable jobs.

These are the dispossessed ones of a farm economy increasingly dominated by giant agricultural corporations; and they are even more subject to the dislocating impact of new technology than workers in our swiftly automating factories, offices, mines and distributing networks.

The migrants are sharecroppers evicted by the onrush of mechanization, tenant farmers unequipped for a shift to urban employment, members of minority groups—Negroes and Mexican-Americans—turned into nomads by the racial antagonisms that shut them out of opportunities for education and self-improvement. These are the discards of a rural revolution, the 1960 counterparts of the Okies and Arkies whose suffering was impressed on the public consciousness two decades ago by John Steinbeck's "The Grapes of Wrath."

No Federal minimum wage law sets a floor under their pay scales or a ceiling over their working hours. They share with the rest of the country's 2 million hired farmhands vulnerability to a chaotic wage structure that puts them further and further behind industrial pay standards each year. A half-century ago farmworkers earned two-thirds as much as factory workers. By the end of World War II the ratio had dropped to a little less than half. The present farm aver-

age of 80 cents an hour is barely a third the factory average of \$2.29.

And even this falls to give a real measure of the farmworker's penury. For a man must live by the year, not by the hour. On that yardstick, the farm laborer is so much an alien to normal American standards that Protestant missionaries from 27 countries of Europe, Asia, and Africa seek assignment to migrant work camps. They explain that conditions there come closest to matching those they will have to contend with when they move on to stations in Nepal, Sierra Leone, Korea, and other areas of great want.

The migrant works when there is a crop to tend and that means, for all his traveling, an average of 1 day in 3 on a year-round basis. A freeze, a drought, or a blight may cut even this meager expectation by wiping out a harvest on which he counted for a month or more of work. The farmworker's average total earnings for 1958, the latest year for which Government records have been tabulated, came to \$961, and \$195 of this was derived from odd jobs he managed to find outside farming.

With their fathers' wages so far below the national average family income of \$6,520 a year, the children of these wanderers are in bondage to the cycle of crops that shapes their lives. A boy is born "in the potatoes"; his baby sister dies "in the asparagus." By the time a youngster is 10, he is much more expert at cultivating the fields than at cultivating his mind. A Florida educator summed up the problem bluntly: "Beans are in competition with school in this country, and beans are winning out."

In the few States that even attempt to enforce child-labor prohibitions in agriculture, the need for extra family income is so strong that parents and children conspire to frustrate the inspectors. Their advent causes a quick spread across the fields of some such watchword as "Pick 'em clean, Joe." This is the signal for all the underage harvesters to flatten themselves among the vegetables until the intruders go away.

For the communities through which they pass, the education of the migrant children is an unwelcome and usually an unaccepted responsibility. The reasons are simple: school funds are limited, classes overcrowded, teachers overworked, a combination that evokes no enthusiasm over a large-scale influx of rootless strangers whose unorthodox upbringing and sketchy prior schooling complicate the task of assimilation.

Pilot projects in New York and several other States have demonstrated that the education problem can be met with encouraging results where the will to meet it exists. But hostility is still the predominant community attitude toward the migrant, not only in schools but in social and civic affairs.

It is only when disaster hits, in the form of fire, flood, or other destructive quirk of nature, that the community's heart opens to the agricultural wayfarer and engulfs him in a torrent of public and private benevolence. But the compassion passes with the emergency. The transient farmworker then finds himself again a voiceless, voteless outsider, wanted only so long as there is a crop to gather.

Now that the northward trek has begun, you can see him through the windows of a dilapidated bus, or sitting on an overturned bushel basket in the back of a truck, or crowded with his family and all their belongings in an automobile with threadbare tires. Or you will find him standing stolidly by the road while his crewleader tries to fix an ancient motor.

His route may carry him close to the launching pads that someday will start a man toward outer space, but his concern will be with the tarpaulin under which he huddles to avoid a pelting rain. His earthly goods are crammed into a galvanized wash-

tub, a gunny sack, and a cardboard valise or two. A patchwork quilt, a guitar, a one-legged doll, a Bible, a pinup torn from a magazine—these symbolize gracious living for the migrant.

Visit his lodgings, and you are likely to feel yourself back with Jeeter Lester on "Tobacco Road." The dismaying part of this feeling is that what you see represents a substantial improvement over the conditions of a few years ago.

Yet for every tidy migrant camp, there remain a dozen in which a displaced person would find it hard to escape memories of his days in a concentration camp. Narrow cubicles to house a family of six, with a bed, a kerosene stove, and a stark electric bulb as the sole furnishings; stopped-up plumbing in the central sanitary units and a general atmosphere of filth and neglect are the hallmarks of these blue-sky slums.

A Catholic priest told a Senate subcommittee a few months ago that he visited a migrant family in Indiana one evening to bring two pairs of shoes for children who needed them to go to school. The family consisted of father, mother, and eight youngsters, packed into a cabin that measured 14 by 21 feet. As the priest was leaving, the eldest daughter asked whether the church could supply some baby clothes.

The priest said "Yes," and asked to see the baby. The girl's reply was that her mother was going to give birth that night. The mother was resting on the bed in the dim light at the rear of the cabin, and it was only then that the priest discovered she had been planning to deliver without medical assistance in the crowded room. He rushed her to South Bend, where she had the baby in a hospital less than 2 hours later.

Such stoicism is characteristic of the migrant. In a period of rising social restlessness, this most rootless of Americans shows little disposition to rebel or even to rail against his lot.

The chairman of the subcommittee investigating migrant problems, Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, got an insight into how little it takes to make some migrants happy when he inspected a shack within sight of Princeton's spires. It was a tumbledown hut, with no table or chairs—merely a bed, a two-burner stove, and a board for pots and pans. But what made it home for the lady of the house was an orange crate set on end and covered with a strip of oil cloth, on which nestled her jam and condiments. "Since I got my shelf, everything is lovely," she told the Senator.

Perhaps the cruelest part of the migrant's plight is that much of his underemployment and depressed wage status stems from his involuntary competition with a group of workers even more deprived than he. This group is made up of the 450,000 Mexican nationals (known as braceros, from the Mexican word for strong-armed men) who are brought in each year to do contract labor on large farms in Texas, California and other Southwestern States.

They are a legalized version of the wetbacks who used to ford the Rio Grande until the exploitation to which they were subjected and their undercutting effect on the already abysmal standards of domestic farm labor forced a joint decision by the United States and Mexico to stop the illicit movement.

Now a panel of consultants appointed by Secretary of Labor Mitchell reports that abuses are ingrained in the program setup to prevent unfair competition between the American migrants and the Mexicans. Its conclusion is that wage levels have been forced down and domestic workers frozen out of jobs in regions dominated by what the AFL-CIO calls "imported colonialism."

The whole program functions like a transplant from "Alice in Wonderland." Its aim is to confine the employment of foreign

workers to crops deemed essential by Secretary of Agriculture Benson. But he declares no commodities nonessential, not even those the taxpayers are already being charged millions of dollars to store as surplus. The result is that 60 percent of the braceros work on crops in surplus supply.

The synthetic character of the "labor shortage" they come to relieve is best illustrated in Texas, which imported 225,000 Mexican nationals to work in its fields last year. The vacuum they filled was created in large measure by the departure of tens of thousands of Texans of Mexican extraction for migratory jobs at higher pay in Oregon, Washington, and the Midwest. Little wonder that Secretary Mitchell and many other experts have concluded that establishment of a Federal minimum wage for farmworkers is imperative.

The difficulty is in piercing the political and economic walls that have long blocked the extension to migrants of the same social benefits the rest of us take for granted. In a year when farm income is down 16 percent and farmers are vowing vengeance at the polls, few ranking Republicans or Democrats are eager to accept responsibility for raising farm-labor costs or otherwise antagonizing farm operators.

The growers contend that all the pressure for intensified regulation comes from do-gooders and know-nothings. They speak glowingly of the character-building effect of living and working together in family groups. They extol a calling that enables the migrant to indulge the same sunworshipping urge as the millionaire with a summer estate in the North and a winter retreat in the South. They rattle off the records of a laborer with three children under 16 who made \$1,039.89 in a month picking strawberries or one with six children who made \$613.30 in 2 weeks.

And in almost the same breath they complain that many migrants turn decent housing into pigsties, drink, fight and comport themselves at a jungle level of morality. They see no reason why they should be expected to pay an industrial wage to workers whom industry has rejected or bypassed, and they warn that pushing up costs not only will make food and cotton more expensive to the consumer but also will price the migrant out of the labor market and hasten his replacement by machines.

The champions of improved standards are less sure that higher farm wages will actually mean higher food prices. They rely on the increased incentive for investing in labor-saving equipment to step up productivity and thus neutralize much of the rise in the total labor bill. This expectation is heightened by the extent to which the rovers are concentrated in huge factories-in-the-field, rather than on the vanishing family farm.

The great bulk of all migrants and braceros work on 5 percent of the country's farms; the lower their pay scales, the tougher it is for the family farmer to compete with these "agribusinesses." Yet the front for most of the pleas to exempt farm laborers from protective legislation is provided by the hardships that would be inflicted on the very farmers who don't hire them.

The friends of the migrant are unimpressed with the suggestion that he is too barbaric to respect good housing. To argue that, having been born to squalor, he revels in its perpetuation is to repeat the classic defense of slum landlords in the "lung blocks" of the old East Side that it was pointless to give immigrant tenants bathtubs because they would merely use them to store coal.

Already scores of big farmers in all sections have discovered that decent housing is a potent lure for good workers. They come, they stay, and they sign up to come again next year. Church groups supply volunteers to teach the women the rudiments of homemaking.

The greatest problem for the instructors, accustomed to such comforts as refrigerators, washing machines, private bathrooms, telephones, rugs, and pictures on the wall, is to realize how distant these appurtenances of normal existence are from the special world of the migrant.

A carpentry teacher was blithely showing a group of youthful farm workers how to make bookends before it was brought home to him that they had neither books nor tables to put them on. An instructor in home nursing found she had lost her class after painstakingly telling them how to make their sick husbands or children feel better. "Use plenty of pillows, and be sure to brighten up the bed tray with a flower," was her tinkling advice.

Out of such experiences does come better understanding between the residents of nowhere and the communities they touch. But real acceptance has yet to be achieved. The wanderers remain orphans in a welfare state, as much in need of the sheltering arm of government as they were in 1951 when President Truman's Commission on Migratory Labor dubbed them "children of misfortune."

Ironically, one of the places they need protection most is to curb the rapacity of the unscrupulous among their own crew leaders and labor contractors. These are the middlemen who link migrant and grower in a hiring system more susceptible to rackets than the outlawed "shapeup" on the New York-New Jersey waterfront.

The crew leaders yank themselves out of the migrant stream by their own will to succeed. Too often their success is built on kickbacks, jacked-up prices for food and liquor, and a monopoly over gambling, prostitution, and marijuana. A recent report by the Oregon Bureau of Labor indicated that the four largest Spanish-speaking labor contractors in the West received direct fees totaling \$8,625 to \$17,250 a week from their 5,750 crew members. And this, it was emphasized, was only part of their take.

If any farm-labor bill goes through Congress this year, it will probably be one calling for the registration of crew leaders and the filing of reports intended to eradicate chiseling.

The discovery by the Williams subcommittee that at least half the 100,000 migrant children of school age are 1 to 4 years behind in scholastic attainment has prompted a bill to provide Federal funds for educating such youngsters in local schools. Companion measures would finance special courses to train grownups in the fundamentals of modern living and make available Government-insured loans to help substitute homes for hovels.

Whether these efforts can be meaningful without a frontal attack on low farm pay is conjectural. But the prospect of any real battle in Congress this year to extend the principles of the Fair Labor Standards Act to farm workers seems nil.

The only bit of social legislation that treats the migrant as a first-class citizen is the old-age insurance program of the Federal Social Security Act. And even here collection abuses by employers and crew leaders cheat many migrants out of their eligibility rights.

Migrants are almost total outsiders in unemployment insurance, and only in California, Ohio and Hawaii do they have the same safeguards under workmen's compensation as other workers. Residency laws bar them from public relief in most States and such commonplaces of industrial employment as paid vacations, holidays, sick leave, overtime and employer-financed pensions or welfare funds are unknown to them.

Farm organizations favor leaving it to the States to erect whatever new legal shields may be necessary. However, William L. Batt Jr., secretary of labor and industry in Penn-

sylvania, a State far ahead of most in developing a forceful labor code, says it will be 2005 or later before any kind of national protection emerges from State-by-State action.

Many experts believe that no real solution can be found until mechanization becomes so universal that the only seasonal farmworkers needed will be a relatively small force of mobile technicians enjoying the same high wages as the roving construction crews that build massive dams, hydroelectric plants and atomic energy installations.

But salutary as such a development may be in long-range terms, it points to a generation of migrationless migrants caught in a transitional squeeze that will make them largely public charges while they receive the retraining necessary to fit them for work in an urban setting.

Will such monumental problems be solved—both those that make the migrant's today so dark and those that shadow his tomorrow? This is the answer Secretary Mitchell gives:

"The migrant problem will not be ignored, nor can people be led to ignore it. Our community will find ways to solve it, and by community I mean the community of citizens that make up America, citizens with wisdom and compassion and good sense, and citizens who save their final censure for those who stand by and seem unable to find within their economy a place for conscience."

LOYALTY OATH PROVISION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the more unfortunate pieces of legislation which, in all probability, will be considered by the Senate in the waning days of the 86th Congress will be S. 2929. This bill proposes to remove the requirement under the National Defense Education Act of 1958 that each student must file an affidavit that he does not believe in or advocate the overthrow of the Government by force or violence.

Legislation of similar import was reported to the floor of the Senate at the last session. The Senate, in its good wisdom and with a display of sound judgment, recommitted this legislation to the committee from whence it had unfortunately come.

There have been many organizations and educational institutions which have taken positions on this proposed legislation. The stand taken recently by the National Daughters of the American Revolution should command the attention and consideration of each of us who will be faced with this issue at a later time this year. This organization is known for its promotion of the principles of Americanism and its fight for the preservation of the form of government which our Founding Fathers endeavored to establish.

Last week at the 69th Continental Congress of the National Daughters of the American Revolution there was passed a resolution supporting the loyalty oath provision of the National Defense Education Act. This action once again reemphasizes the sound principles which serve as a hallmark of this great organization. It was my pleasure on March 21 to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Sumter Daily Item of Sumter, S.C., which commended this outstanding organization

for resolutions which it had adopted in its last continental congress. It is a pleasure for me to once again call the attention of my colleagues to the actions of this organization, which consistently deserve the study of all good Americans.

WILLIAM R. CONNOLE, VICE CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the President of the United States, at his press conference today, reaffirmed his statement that he would not reappoint as Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, Mr. William R. Connole. I should like to read a brief item from this week's issue of Time magazine, entitled "The Price of Dissent":

THE PRICE OF DISSENT

The maverick on the Federal Power Commission is William R. Connole, 37, a Connecticut political independent. For the past 5 years Connole has built a reputation as a dissenter from his colleagues, a defender of the consumer by urging stricter regulation of natural gas prices. He was the lone dissenter in the precedent-setting C.A.T.C. case (Time, July 8, 1957), when the FPC allowed new field gas sales worth \$1 billion without final approval of the rates. Connole's dissent was implicitly endorsed by the U.S. Supreme Court when it criticized the FPC decision, upholding the contention of New York State's Public Service Commission that the failure to set firm rates did not sufficiently protect the consumer. Last week the White House confirmed reports that Dissenter Connole would not be reappointed when his term expires on June 22. His likely successor: Harold I. Baynton, now chief counsel to the Senate Commerce Committee.

Keen, combative, Connole is a Hartford lawyer who was appointed to the FPC in 1955 after serving as general counsel of the Connecticut Public Utilities Commission. When word got out that he was not to be reappointed, seven State public utility commissions protested. Unmoved, the White House said that the President decided not to reappoint Connole because he does not get along with the other Commissioners, has urged greater Federal control of gas than the administration believes is necessary. Explained a presidential aid: "There is no reason to keep a man in a job whose philosophy does not agree with that of the President."

I think this item from Time magazine is very appropriately entitled "The Price of Dissent." All Senators are well aware of the fact that the Federal Power Commission is supposed to be an independent agency, independent of the Executive as well as independent of Congress.

Before I comment further on this matter, I should like to read another brief article, which was published in last night's Washington Star.

The article is entitled "Mayors' Group Backs Connole," and reads as follows:

Some big city mayors have asked President Eisenhower to reappoint William R. Connole to the Federal Power Commission. They said Mr. Connole is the only Commissioner looking out for consumers of natural gas.

The United States Mayors' Committee on Natural Gas Legislation wired its appeal to Mr. Eisenhower yesterday. There have been unconfirmed reports that the President does not intend to reappoint Mr. Connole to the FPC when his 5-year term expires June 22.

Those unconfirmed reports were confirmed today by the President at his news conference.

Mayor Richardson Dilworth of Philadelphia, secretary of the group, said Mr. Connole was a "heroic exception" to what he called a do-nothing pattern of the other four Commissioners. Natural gas prices, he said, have risen almost seven times as fast as the average commodity in the past 6 years. The FPC regulates gas prices to consumers.

Mr. Dilworth protested any move to drop Mr. Connole, "the only member of the FPC from east of the Mississippi, the area in which most of the natural gas is consumed."

Mr. Connole, 37, who comes from Connecticut, was named to the \$20,000-a-year job by Mr. Eisenhower in 1955.

Along with other Commissioners, including FPC Chairman Jerome Kuykendall, Mr. Connole has acknowledged private talks with a lawyer for a gas company that had a case pending before the FPC.

Mr. Connole and the others have denied any impropriety in their off-the-record talks with the attorney, Thomas G. Corcoran.

The White House has declined to confirm or deny the reports that Mr. Connole is on the way out and Mr. Connole himself has refused to talk about it. Congressional sources said, however, that he was told by the White House some time ago that he would not be reappointed.

I should like to call attention to one more quotation, and this from a very interesting source—Petroleum Week, for June 19, 1959. Petroleum Week is a publication which is not exactly a trade association journal, but it speaks, in some cases, for the oil industry. The article is entitled "Four Government Officials Hold the Keys to Depletion, Gas Regulation, Oil Prices." It comments on the fact that Mr. Connole is the key to whether this country will have any kind of regulation in the interest of gas consumers. The article reads, in part:

While some FPC members have dragged their feet on producer regulation since the U.S. Supreme Court's Phillips gas decision in 1954, Connole, since his appointment in 1955, has strived for an early and workable method of determining producer gas prices.

Because he insists that production costs are a vital factor in rate determination, and because he is FPC's strongest adherent of regulation, Connole has become something of an enemy in the view of many gas producers.

But he has the respect of those who disagree with his views. "He is smart, he works hard, and he does his homework," says one Washington gas industry representative.

That is what a representative of the gas industry said concerning a man as to whom the President said today he thought he could find a better man for the job. The oil industry representatives themselves admit that Mr. Connole, who has fought against them and for the consumer, is smart, that he works hard, and does his homework. The gas industry representative continued by saying:

When he takes a stand on a case, you can argue his theory but seldom his knowledge of the case.

The article states that Connole has outstanding qualifications, and continues:

Looking at FPC's problems, Connole sees initial gas prices in contracts in south Louisiana as the most important short-range

difficulty. He wants FPC to start now to investigate producer rates, which rose from an average of 8 cents to 21 cents per thousand cubic feet, in 4 years. Connole says he doesn't know whether the prices are too high—or even too low—but he thinks a strong look is necessary.

Mr. President, this is the kind of man, a man with preeminent qualifications and ability, whom the President has decided not to reappoint.

Mr. Connole was a dissenter on the FPC, and the No. 1 defender of the consumer. In spite of the suggestion that he does not get along with the other commissioners, it appears that Mr. Connole has had the respect of much of the oil industry, even though he was a controversial figure, and they may not have liked some of his rulings.

Mr. President, apparently the only reason for dropping Mr. Connole from the Federal Power Commission is that he favors stricter control of the gas and oil industry than does the President. Although the President has a right to appoint the Commissioners, it seems a flagrant violation of the bipartisan principle on which these commissions are supposedly founded, when a Commissioner who was appointed as an independent, and who has given the public excellent service, is dropped because his views are not those of the President. In the Humphrey case, in the 1930's, the Supreme Court held that the President could not remove a member of one of the independent regulatory commissions just because the commissioner did not agree with the President's views in regard to how the commission should decide cases or conduct its business. It would seem to be a gross violation of the spirit of these commissions for the President to refuse, on such grounds of difference of opinion, to reappoint an able commissioner, and the only member of the commission who represents the interests of the consumers. This situation seems particularly unfortunate when we consider the fact that the President will be able to make a new appointment virtually on the eve of his leaving the office of President, and thus the appointment will carry over for a number of years into the term of the next President.

Mr. President, President Eisenhower has said he could find a better man to do this job. I ask, better for whom? For the consumers—I doubt it. For the big oil and gas boys—you bet your life.

As I have stated, the President has indicated that he will not reappoint the one and only member of the Federal Power Commission who is recognized as a fighting representative of the viewpoint of the consumers. This announcement comes after a sorry record of notorious acceptances of hospitality by the President's appointee to be the head of the Federal Communications Commission, and by the President's appointee to be the head of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and by some of the other Presidential appointees to the Federal Power Commission.

This situation should suggest, Mr. President, how tragically the "dice are loaded" against the consumers, by means of the operation of this administration.

We recall that Mr. Doerfer, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, was entertained for 6 days on a yacht owned by the head of one of the companies which is subject to regulation by the Federal Communications Commission; and we recall that, more recently, Mr. Durfee was nominated by the President for membership on the Civil Aeronautics Board, and his nomination was confirmed by the Senate, after Mr. Durfee had accepted hospitality—which was paid for by some of the groups which that Commission is charged with regulating—at a Pinehurst golfing trip. We also recall that recently some of the other members of the Federal Power Commission accepted a free airplane trip from the big gas boys to the funeral of one of the members of that body.

Mr. President, how can the consumer possibly get a fair break in such a situation? Administration appointees are wined and dined by officials of the groups they are charged with regulating; but, despite that situation, those appointees are honored.

On the other hand, a Commissioner who has fought hard in the interests of the consumers is to be replaced, we understand; the President says he thinks he can find a better man.

Mr. President, I suggest that the Senate very carefully scrutinize the qualifications of any proposed successor of Mr. Connole. We should do this regardless of how excellent may be the senatorial contacts of the new appointee. That should be done pursuant to our recognition of the obligation of the Senate to see to it that the consumers of the country are represented by at least one member of the Commission who is willing to fight for their interests and, if not to serve on the Commission in the role of a successful champion for them, at least to serve there as an effective dissenter.

Mr. President, it has been with some reluctance that I have brought this matter to the attention of the Senate, because such a nomination does not come within the jurisdiction of any committee on which I serve, and therefore it is not a matter of immediate responsibility to me. However, I am deeply shocked by this situation, which even Time magazine—which is a very reluctant critic, at best, of President Eisenhower—has hit and hit hard, and when the mayors of various cities in the country have made their protest clear and emphatic, and when the public-utility commissioners have stated that they think Mr. Connole is a defender of the interests of the consuming public. This situation has developed at the very time when the general public is shocked by the notorious misbehavior of certain members of these Commissions who presumably are representing the public, but, in fact, are involved in a very unfortunate guest-host situation with the very persons and groups they are supposed to regulate. Mr. President, this is a classic example of gross disregard of the public interest in behalf of special interests. Anyone want to know why the price of gas, the cost of living goes up? Here is your answer.

PADRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE PARK BILL SHOULD BE PASSED IN THE FORM WHICH SECRETARY SEATON RECOMMENDS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, ever since introducing my original bill 2 years ago, I have believed and advocated that the proposed Padre Island National Seashore Park should be 100 miles long; that is, it should cover the entire portion of the 117-mile natural island beach not already lost through private development. A great many Texans and others support me in this position.

However, another group of Texans and other Americans who are interested in this exceptionally significant project favor retaining most of the island—about 70 miles of it—for private development, and setting aside only 50 miles, in the middle, for a national seashore park. This plan seems to me unworkable, principally for two reasons.

First, it would constitute a financial windfall to private promoters, because it would mean that the Government, with tax dollars, would build a 70-mile highway system from each end of the island, to provide access to the national seashore area in the middle of the island. Such a highway system would cost millions of tax dollars, and would serve to greatly enhance the price of seafront lots for the private developers.

Second, aside from the fact that the 50-mile area in the middle of the island would prove to be too small, in the years immediately ahead, a considerable portion of the middle part of the island is not the most desirable for use as a beach park because it is composed of mud flats instead of beautiful sand dunes.

A few days ago, Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton wrote to the able and distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] a letter advising the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that the Department of Interior urges the enactment of legislation to create Padre Park and similar seashore areas on Cape Cod and the Oregon Dunes. In his letter, Secretary Seaton followed the recommendation of National Park Advisory Board, and suggested that approximately 88 miles of this 117-mile-long island be set aside for the Padre Island National seashore area.

Mr. President, I submit that is a fair and reasonable compromise of the question of area. And in writing to the Senator from Montana, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which is considering my bill, S. 4, to create a Padre Island seashore area, I have stated that I will consider it significant and constructive if the Congress establishes an 88-mile-long park on Padre Island. I am giving my full support and effort to getting a park of this size, although personally I would prefer to have the park be 100 miles long. But I regard the 88-mile section a substantial part of it.

At the same time, I hope that those who have favored the small 50-mile park in the middle of the island will likewise give some ground, and will agree to work for the establishment of the

88-mile park recommended by Secretary Seaton, and will help secure the enactment of such legislation at this session.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of my letter on this question to Senator MURRAY; and also the text of the proposed bill which Secretary Seaton favors, and which I am supporting as a substitute for my bill, S. 4.

On April 15, Secretary Seaton forwarded the substitute to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. MURRAY] and recommended enactment of the bill.

There being no objection, the letter and the proposed bill were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 23, 1960.

The Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: I have reviewed, with great pleasure, Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton's letter to you of April 15, endorsing legislation proposing national seashore areas at Cape Cod, Padre Island, and the Oregon Dunes. I am very gratified that the Department of Interior has joined the many who favor action on these proposals.

In studying the draft legislation proposed by the Department of Interior, I am somewhat disappointed that they did not recommend acquiring a full 100 miles of beach for the Padre Island area; however, I shall consider it a significant and constructive step if the recommended 88-mile length is authorized by the Congress. I think this recommended 88-mile length is the minimum length that should be considered. In other respects, I support the Department of Interior's recommended legislation as a substitute for my bill, S. 4, with perhaps minor changes to be revealed by additional study.

I hope that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will soon take such favorable action as will enable Padre Island seashore area legislation to be enacted this session.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

RALPH W. YARBOROUGH.

SUGGESTED REVISION OF SEASHORE BILL

A bill to save and preserve, for the public use and benefit, a portion of the remaining undeveloped seashore of the United States, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to save and preserve, for purposes of public recreation, benefit, and inspiration, a portion of the diminishing seashore of the United States that remains undeveloped, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to take appropriate action in the public interest toward the establishment of three national seashores set forth in section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 2. (a) The area comprising that portion of the land and waters located in the towns of Provincetown, Truro, Wellfleet, Eastham, Orleans, and Chatham in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and described in subsection (b), is designated for establishment as Cape Cod National Seashore.

(b) The area referred to in subsection (a) is described as follows:

Beginning at a point in the Atlantic Ocean one-quarter of a mile due west of the mean low-water line of the Atlantic Ocean on Cape Cod at the westernmost extremity of Race Point, Provincetown, Massachusetts;

thence from the point of beginning along a line a quarter of a mile offshore of and parallel to the mean low-water line of the Atlantic Ocean, Cape Cod Bay, and Provincetown Harbor in generally southerly, easterly, and northerly directions rounding Long Point and then southwesterly to a point a quarter of a mile offshore of the mean low-water line on the harbor side of the dike depicted on the United States Geological Survey Provincetown quadrangle sheet (1949) crossing an arm of the Provincetown Harbor;

thence northerly, along a line a quarter of a mile offshore of and parallel to the low-water line at the dike to a point easterly of the point of intersection of the sand dike with the boundary of the Province Lands Reservation as depicted on the said Provincetown quadrangle sheet;

thence westerly to the said point of intersection of the dike and the Province Lands Reservation boundary;

thence along the boundaries of the Province Lands Reservation northwesterly, northeasterly, northerly, and easterly to the easternmost corner of the Reservation being near United States Route 6;

thence leaving the said easternmost corner along an extension of the southerly Reservation boundary line easterly to the northerly right-of-way line of United States Route 6;

thence along the northerly right-of-way line of United States Route 6 in a generally easterly direction crossing the Truro-Provincetown town line to and continuing in the town of Truro to a point four-tenths of a mile southeasterly of Highland Road;

thence leaving the northerly right-of-way line of United States Route 6 and running due east two-tenths of a mile;

thence turning and running in a southeasterly direction paralleling the general alignment of United States Route 6 and generally distant therefrom two-tenths of a mile crossing Pamet Road and continuing to a point three-tenths of a mile southerly thereof;

thence westerly to the intersection of Old County Road and Mill Pond Road;

thence southerly along the easterly right-of-way line of Old County Road to Fisher Road;

thence westerly along the southerly right-of-way line of Fisher Road to the right-of-way line of the New York, New Haven, and Hartford Railroad;

thence southerly along the easterly right-of-way line of the railroad for three-tenths of a mile;

thence due west to a point in Cape Cod Bay one-quarter of a mile distant from the mean low-water line;

thence turning and running along a line a quarter of a mile offshore of and parallel to the mean low-water line of Cape Cod Bay in a general southerly and easterly direction rounding Jeremy Point and thence in a general northerly direction along a line a quarter of a mile offshore of and parallel to the mean low-water line on the westerly side of Wellfleet Harbor to a point one-quarter of a mile due north of the mean low-water line at the eastern tip of Great Island as depicted on the United States Geological Survey Wellfleet quadrangle sheet (1949);

thence leaving Wellfleet Harbor and running three-tenths of a mile northwesterly to the top of a ridge between Herring River and the Chequesset Country Club as depicted on the said Wellfleet quadrangle sheet;

thence northeasterly along the said ridge continuing across Mill Creek on a straight line following in general a ridge and crossing the right-of-way of the New York, New Haven, and Hartford Railroad to a point two-tenths of a mile northeasterly thereof;

thence due north to a point three-tenths of a mile beyond the Bound Brook Island Road;

thence generally easterly following the southerly contour of a marsh, as depicted on the said Wellfleet quadrangle sheet crossing United States Route 6, and continuing to a point on the easterly right-of-way line of a power transmission line as depicted on the said Wellfleet quadrangle sheet;

thence in a general southerly direction along the said easterly right-of-way line of a power transmission line, crossing the Eastham-Wellfleet town line, to the intersection of said easterly right-of-way line with the easterly right-of-way of Nauset Road;

thence in a general southeasterly direction along said easterly right-of-way line of Nauset Road to the intersection of Nauset Road and Salt Pond Road;

thence crossing said Nauset Road and running along the easterly right-of-way line of said Salt Pond Road to its intersection with the southerly right-of-way line of Nauset Road;

thence westerly along the southerly right-of-way line of Nauset Road to its intersection with the easterly right-of-way line of United States Route 6;

thence southerly along the easterly right-of-way line of United States Route 6 to a point four-tenths of a mile southerly of the intersection of Locust Road and United States Route 6;

thence easterly to a point one-tenth of a mile from United States Route 6;

thence turning and running in a generally southerly direction paralleling the general alignment of United States Route 6 and generally distant therefrom one-tenth of a mile to a small stream approximately one-tenth of a mile beyond Governor Prence Road extended;

thence southeasterly along the stream and continuing to the Orleans-Eastham town line;

thence along the Orleans-Eastham town line to the southerly tip of Stony Island;

thence generally southerly in the town of Orleans to the easterly edge of the Nauset Harbor Channel as depicted on the United States Geological Survey Orleans quadrangle sheet (1946);

thence in a generally southerly direction along the said easterly edge of the Nauset Harbor Channel to a point due south of the southwesterly tip of Nauset Beach on the north side of the entrance to Nauset Harbor from the Atlantic Ocean as depicted on the said Orleans quadrangle sheet;

thence due south to the twenty-foot contour in Nauset Heights as delineated on the said Orleans quadrangle sheet;

thence generally southerly along the said twenty-foot contour to a point about one-tenth of a mile northerly of Beach Road;

thence southwesterly along a line intersecting Beach Road at a point two-tenths of a mile easterly of the so-called Nauset Road leading northerly to Nauset Heights;

thence southerly to the head of a tributary to Little Pleasant Bay at the northerly tip of Pochet Neck as depicted on the said Orleans quadrangle sheet;

thence generally southerly along the thread of channel of the said tributary passing westerly and southwesterly to Pochet Island and thence southwesterly into Little Pleasant Bay passing to westerly of the northerly tip of Sampson Island, the westerly tip of Money Head, and the southwesterly tip of Hog Island following in general the center line of Little Pleasant Bay to Pleasant Bay;

thence generally southeasterly in Pleasant Bay along a line passing midway between Sipson Island and Nauset Beach to a point on the Chatham-Orleans town line one-quarter of a mile westerly of the mean low-water line of Pleasant Bay on the westerly shore of Nauset Beach;

thence generally southerly in Pleasant Bay in the town of Chatham along a line a

quarter of a mile offshore of and parallel to the said mean low-water line of Pleasant Bay on the westerly shore of Nauset Beach to a point a quarter of a mile south of the mean low-water line of the southern tip of Nauset Beach;

thence easterly rounding the southern tip of Nauset Beach along a line a quarter of a mile offshore of and parallel thereto;

thence generally northerly and northwesterly, and westerly along a line a quarter of a mile offshore of and parallel to the mean low-water line of the Atlantic Ocean on the easterly shore of Nauset Beach and on to the outer cape to the point of beginning.

Also included in such area are lands located in the town of Chatham and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the northwesterly corner of the boundary of Monomoy National Wildlife Refuge at the mean low-water line on the western shore of Morris Island;

thence generally southerly, westerly, southerly, easterly, and northerly along the exterior boundary line of said Monomoy National Wildlife Refuge to a point on the northeasterly corner of said refuge located on the mean low-water line on the eastern shore of Morris Island;

thence northerly, westerly, and southerly along the mean low-water line of Morris Island and Stage Island to the point of beginning.

(c) The area comprising the portion of the land and waters of Padre Island situated in the coastal waters that is described below is designated for establishment as the Padre Island National Seashore:

Beginning at a point one mile northerly of North Bird Island on the easterly line of the Intracoastal Waterway; thence due east to a point on Padre Island one mile west of the mean high water line of the Gulf of Mexico; thence southwesterly paralleling the said mean high water line of the Gulf of Mexico, a distance of about 3.5 miles; thence due east to the two-fathom line on the east side of Padre Island as depicted on U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey Chart No. 1286; thence along the said two-fathom line on the east side of Padre Island as depicted on U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey Charts Nos. 1286, 1287, and 1288 for a distance of approximately 85 miles; thence westerly crossing Padre Island to the easterly line of the Intracoastal Waterway at a point northerly of Three Islands; thence northerly following the easterly line of the Intracoastal Waterway as indicated by channel markers in the Laguna Madre to the point of beginning.

(d) The area comprising the portion of the land and waters along the Oregon coast, and described in subsection (e), is designated for establishment as the Oregon Dunes National Seashore.

(e) The area referred to in subsection (d) is described as follows:

Township 18 south, range 12 west, beginning at the southeast corner of the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 34;

Thence east to the southwest corner of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of the said section 34;

South to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 10, township 19 south, range 12 west;

West to the southwest corner of the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of the said section 10;

South to the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 15;

East to the point of intersection with the shoreline of Woahink Lake at elevation thirty-eight feet above sea level;

Following the said shoreline generally north and east to the intersection of the said

shoreline with the quarter section line of section 11;

East to the northeast corner of the southeast quarter of the said section 11;

South to the southeast corner of the said section;

East to the northeast corner of section 13;

South to the southeast corner of the said section 13;

East to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of section 19, township 19 south, range 11 west;

South to the southeast corner of northwest quarter of the said section 19;

East to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of the said section 19;

South to the southwest corner of the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 31;

West to the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of the said section 31;

South to the southwest corner of the northeast quarter of section 7, township 20 south, range 12 west;

West to the southeast corner of the northwest quarter of section 12, township 20 north, range 12 west;

North to the northeast corner of the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 12;

West to the west right-of-way of Southern Pacific Railway in section 11, township 20 south, range 12 west;

In a generally southerly and westerly direction along Southern Pacific Railway west right-of-way to the intersection with the line between section 11 and section 14;

West to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 11;

North to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 11;

West to the southeast corner of the northwest quarter of section 10;

North to the northeast corner of the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 8;

West to the northwest corner of the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 3;

North to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 3;

West to the northwest corner of section 3;

South to the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of section 3;

West to the northwest corner of the southeast quarter of section 4;

South to the southwest corner of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 4;

West to the southwest corner of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 4;

South to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 9;

West to the northwest corner of southwest quarter of section 9;

South along section lines to the point of intersection on the north bank of the Umpqua River with the mean low tide line at a point on a line between section 16 and section 17, township 21 south, range 12 west;

Following the said mean low tide line in a generally southerly and westerly direction to the intersection with the Pacific Ocean, section 1, township 22 south, range 13 west;

Due west 1,320 feet;

In a generally northerly direction paralleling the mean low tide line on the shore to a point due west of the said mean low tide line on the south bank of the mouth of the Siuslaw River;

East to the said mean low tide line on the south bank of the mouth of the Siuslaw River, section 16, township 18 south, range 12 west;

Following the said mean low tide line in a generally southerly and easterly direction to its intersection with a line due north of the point of beginning;

Due south to the point of beginning;

Beginning at a point where the line between ranges 12 west and 13 west (Willamette Meridian), in township 22 south, intersects the mean low tide line on the south shore of Winchester Bay at the mouth of the Umpqua River;

Thence following the said mean low tide line easterly and southerly along the said south shore of Winchester Bay and the west bank of Winchester Creek to its intersection with the west right-of-way boundary of United States Highway Numbered 101, township 22 south, range 12 west;

Following the said right-of-way boundary in a generally southerly direction to its intersection with the mean low waterline on the north bank of Tenmile Creek, in section 13, township 23 south, range 13 west;

Following the said mean low water line along the north bank of the said Tenmile Creek in a generally southwesterly direction to the mean low tide line of the Pacific Ocean at the mouth of the said Tenmile Creek;

Due west 1,320 feet;

In a generally northerly direction paralleling the said mean low tide line on the shore to a point due west of the said mean low tide line on the south bank of the mouth of the Umpqua River;

East to the said mean low tide line on the south bank of the mouth of the Umpqua River, in section 14, township 22 south, range 13 west;

Following the said mean low tide line in a generally northerly and easterly direction to the point of beginning.

(f) The Oregon Dunes National Seashore may be extended by Executive Order of the President at some future time by the addition of a separate unit known as Sea Lion Caves after consultation with and consideration of the recommendation of the Governor of the State of Oregon, said separate unit to include the land, water, and submerged land area in the vicinity of Sea Lion Caves, the exterior boundary limit of which is specifically described as follows:

Township 17 south, range 12 west, beginning at the northeast corner of section 4;

Thence east to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 3;

South to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of the said section 3;

East to the northeast corner of the southwest quarter of the said section 3;

South to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter of the said section 3;

West to the southwest corner of the said section 3;

Due west 3,960 feet;

Due north to a point due west of the point of beginning;

Due east to the point of beginning.

(g) If the Secretary of the Interior finds that any parcel within the Tahkenitch Lake unit is not being used in its entirety primarily for the growth and harvesting of timber on a sustained yield basis, he may, by publishing notice in the Federal Register, extend the boundaries of the Seashore to include said parcel. As used in this subsection, the phrase "parcel within the Tahkenitch Lake unit" means each ownership of land, water, and submerged land within the following described area:

Beginning at the northwest corner of section 13, township 20 south, range 12 west;

South to the southeast corner of section 23;

East to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 25;

South to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter of the northwest quarter of the said section 25;

East to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of the said section 25;

South to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of the said section 25;

West to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter of the said section 25;

South to the southeast corner of the northwest quarter of section 36;

West to the southwest corner of the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of the said section 36;

South to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of the said section 36;

West to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 2, township 21 south, range 12 west;

South to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of the said section 2;

West to the southwest corner of the northeast quarter of the said section 2;

South to the southeast corner of the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of the said section 2;

West to the southwest corner of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of the said section 2;

South to the southwest corner of the said section 2;

West to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 10;

South to the southeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of the said section 10;

West to the northeast corner of the southwest quarter of the northwest quarter of the said section 10;

South to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter of the northwest quarter of the said section 10;

Due west to the point of intersection with the east right-of-way boundary of United States Highway Numbered 101;

Following the said right-of-way boundary in a generally westerly and northerly direction to the point of intersection with the section line between sections 4 and 5, township 21 south, range 12 west;

North to the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of section 9, township 20 south, range 12 west;

East to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 9;

North to the southwest corner of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 4;

East to the southwest corner of the southeast quarter of section 4;

North to the northwest corner of the southeast quarter of section 4;

East to the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of section 3;

North to the northwest corner of section 3;

East to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 3;

South to the northwest corner of the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 3;

East to the northeast corner of the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 3;

South to the southeast corner of the northwest quarter of section 10;

East to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 11;

South to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 11;

East to the point of beginning.

(h) Upon approval of extensions of the seashore as provided in subsections (f) and (g), the provisions of section 3 shall become applicable to the extensions.

Sec. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, condemnation, transfer from any Federal agency, exchange, or otherwise, the land, waters, and other property, and improvements thereon and any interest therein, within the areas described in section 2 of this Act or which lie within the boundaries of a seashore as established under section 4 of this Act (hereinafter referred to as "such area"). Any property, or interest therein, owned by a State or political subdivision thereof may be acquired only with the concurrence of such owner. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Federal property located within such area may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without consideration to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for use by him in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to pay for any acquisitions which he makes by purchase under this Act their fair market value, as determined by the Secretary, who may in his discretion base his determination on an independent appraisal obtained by him.

(c) In exercising his authority to acquire property by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property located within such area and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary within such area. The properties so exchanged shall be approximately equal in fair market value, provided that the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged.

Sec. 4. (a) As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act and following the acquisition by the Secretary of an acreage in each area described in section 2 of this Act, that is in the opinion of the Secretary efficiently administrable to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary shall establish the area as a national seashore by the publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register.

(b) Such notice referred to in subsection (a) of this section shall contain a detailed description of the boundaries of the seashore which shall encompass an area as nearly as practicable identical to the area described in section 2 of this Act. The Secretary shall forthwith after the date of publication of such notice in the Federal Register (1) send a copy of such notice, together with a map showing such boundaries, by registered or certified mail to the Governor of the State and to the governing body of each of the political subdivisions involved; (2) cause a copy of such notice and map to be published in one or more newspapers which circulate in each of the localities; and (3) cause a certified copy of such notice, a copy of such map, and a copy of this Act to be recorded at the registry of deeds for the county involved.

Sec. 5. (a) Any owner or owners (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as "owner") of improved property on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition to such acquisition, retain the right of use and occupancy of his property for non-commercial residential purposes for a term not to exceed twenty-five years, or for a term ending at the death of such owner, the death of his spouse, or the day his last surviving child reaches the age of twenty-one, whichever is the latest. The owner shall elect the term to be reserved. In any case where such an owner retains a right of

use and occupancy as herein provided, such right may during its existence be conveyed or leased, in whole, but not in part. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the fair market value of the property on the date of such acquisition less the fair market value on such date of the right retained by the owner.

(b) The Secretary's authority to acquire property by condemnation shall be suspended with respect to all improved property located in all of the towns referred to in section 2(a) of this Act for one year following the date of its enactment. Thereafter such authority shall be suspended with respect to all improved property in any of such towns during all times when such town shall have in force and applicable to all property under its jurisdiction and within the established seashore a duly adopted, valid zoning bylaw approved by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of this Act.

(c) The Secretary's authority to acquire property by condemnation shall be suspended with respect to any particular property in the area referred to in section 2(b) of this Act which is used for commercial or industrial purposes during any periods when such use is permitted by the Secretary and during the pendency of the first application for such permission made to the Secretary after the date of enactment of this Act provided such application is made not later than the date of establishment of the seashore.

(d) As used in this Act, the term "improved property" shall mean a private non-commercial dwelling, including the land on which it is situated, whose construction was begun before September 1, 1959, and structures accessory thereto (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as "dwelling"), together with such amount and locus of the property adjoining and in the same ownership as such dwelling as the Secretary designates to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of such dwelling for the sole purpose of noncommercial residential use and occupancy. In making such designation the Secretary shall take into account the manner of noncommercial residential use and occupancy in which the dwelling and such adjoining property has usually been enjoyed by its owner or occupant. The amount of such adjoining property to be so designated by the Secretary shall in no case be less than three acres in area, or all of such lesser amount as there may be, except that the Secretary may exclude from the amount of adjoining property so designated any beach or waters, together with so much of the land adjoining such beach or waters as the Secretary may deem necessary for public access thereto.

(e) When acquiring land, waters, or interests therein for the Padre Island National Seashore, the Secretary may permit a reservation by the grantor of all or any part of the minerals in such land or waters, with the right of occupation and use of so much of the surface of the land or waters as may be required for all purposes reasonably incident to the mining or removal of the minerals, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary.

Sec. 6. (a) As soon as practicable following the date of enactment of this Act and thereafter as may be required to achieve the purposes of subsection (b) of this section, the Secretary shall issue regulations specifying standards for approval by him of town zoning bylaws for purposes of section 5 of this Act. Any such bylaw which meets such standards shall be approved by the Secretary upon application made to him for such approval.

(b) Any zoning bylaw approved in accordance with subsection (a) of this section shall contribute to the effect of (1) prohibiting the commercial and industrial use, other

than any commercial or industrial use which is permitted by the Secretary, of all property within the boundaries of the seashore which is situated within the town adopting such bylaw; and (2) promoting the preservation and development, in accordance with the purposes of section 1 of this Act, of the area comprising the seashore, by means of acreage, frontage, and setback requirements and other provisions which may be required by such regulations to be included in the zoning bylaw consistent with the laws of Massachusetts.

(c) No zoning bylaw shall be approved by the Secretary which (1) contains any provision which he may consider adverse to the preservation and development, in accordance with the purposes of section 1 of this Act, of the area comprising the seashore, or (2) fails to make provision for the Secretary to receive notice of any variance granted under and any exception made to the application of such bylaw, and notice of any amendment thereof.

(d) If any improved property, with respect to which the Secretary's authority to acquire by condemnation has been suspended in accordance with the provisions of this Act, is made the subject of a variance under or an exception to any zoning bylaw applicable to such improved property so as to exempt it from any applicable standards contained in regulations issued pursuant to this section, the Secretary may, in his discretion, at any time after the date when such exception is made terminate the suspension of his authority to acquire such improved property by condemnation.

Sec. 7. The Secretary shall furnish to any interested person requesting the same a certificate indicating with respect to any property located within the seashore as to which the Secretary's authority to acquire such property by condemnation has been suspended in accordance with the provisions of this Act, that such authority has been so suspended and the reasons therefor.

Sec. 8. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the property acquired by the Secretary under this Act shall be administered by the Secretary, subject to the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535); as amended and supplemented, and in accordance with other laws of general application relating to the national park system as defined by the Act of August 8, 1953 (67 Stat. 496); except that authority otherwise available to the Secretary for the conservation and management of natural resources may be utilized to the extent he finds such authority will further the purposes of this Act.

(b) (1) The Secretary shall develop for appropriate public uses such portions of Cape Cod National Seashore as he deems especially adaptable for such uses, including swimming, boating, sailing, hunting, fishing, appreciation of historic sites and structures and the natural features of the Cape, and other activities of similar nature. The Secretary may also provide for the public enjoyment and understanding of the unique, natural, historic and scientific features and shall establish such trails, observation points and exhibits and provide such services as may be desirable for the purpose. Except for such public use areas and developments and except for improved property therein, the Seashore shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness and no development of the Seashore or plan for the convenience of visitors shall be undertaken by the Secretary which would be incompatible with the preservation of the unique flora and fauna or the physiographic conditions now prevailing in the area described in section 2 of this Act or with the preservation of such historic sites and structures as he may designate.

(2) In developing the Cape Cod National Seashore established pursuant to this Act the Secretary shall, so far as practicable consistent with the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, provide recreational and other facilities for the public in such places and manner as he determines will not diminish for its owners or occupants the value or enjoyment of any improved property located within the park.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, land and waters now or hereafter included in any migratory bird refuge within the boundaries of the Cape Cod National Seashore shall continue as such refuge under applicable laws and regulations, but such lands and waters shall be a part of the park and shall be administered by the Secretary for recreational uses not inconsistent with the purposes of such refuge under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe. Nothing in this Act shall limit the power of the Secretary to acquire lands and waters for any migratory bird refuge.

(d) The Secretary may permit hunting and fishing, including shellfishing, on lands and waters under his jurisdiction within such areas of the Cape Cod National Seashore as he may prescribe. The Secretary shall consult with officials of the State and any political subdivision thereof who have jurisdiction of hunting and fishing, including shellfishing, prior to the issuance of any regulations by the Secretary, and the Secretary is authorized to enter into cooperative arrangements with such officials regarding such hunting and fishing, including shellfishing, as he may deem desirable, except that the Secretary shall leave the regulation of the taking of shellfish in the towns referred to in section 2(a) of this Act to such towns.

(e) The Secretary is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the State of Oregon regarding rules pertaining to hunting and fishing and management programs pertaining to fish, game, wildlife, and wild furbearing animals which will not materially impair the scenic, scientific, and recreational features of the Oregon Dunes National Seashore.

Sec. 9. (a) There is hereby established a Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Commission). The Commission shall terminate ten years after the date the Seashore is established.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of nine members each appointed for a term of two years by the Secretary as follows:

(1) Six members to be appointed from recommendations made by each of the boards of selectmen of the towns referred to in the section 2(a) of this Act, one member from the recommendations made by each such board;

(2) Two members to be appointed from recommendations of the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and

(3) One member to be designated by the Secretary.

(c) The Secretary shall designate one member to be Chairman. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) A member of the Commission shall serve without compensation as such. The Secretary is authorized to pay the expenses reasonably incurred by the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act upon vouchers signed by the Chairman.

(e) The Commission established by this section shall act and advise by affirmative vote of a majority of the members thereof.

(f) The Secretary shall, from time to time, consult with the members of the Commission with respect to matters relating to the development of Cape Cod National Seashore,

and for that purpose shall consult with the members with respect to carrying out the provisions of section 5 and 6 of this Act.

(g) No permit for the commercial or industrial use of property located within the Seashore shall be issued by the Secretary without the advice of the Commission, and, after its termination, without the advice of the board of selectmen of the town affected, if such advice is submitted within a reasonable time.

Sec. 10. (a) The Secretary is authorized to permit the investigation for, and withdrawal of, ground water from the sand dunes and the conveyance thereof outside the boundary of the Oregon Dunes National Seashore for beneficial use, in accordance with the laws of the State of Oregon, and to permit the removal of surface water and the conveyance thereof outside the boundary of the seashore for beneficial use in accordance with the laws of the State of Oregon, when the welfare of the surrounding persons becomes dependent upon the use of such water: *Provided*, That the withdrawal and use of water for these purposes will not materially impair the scenic, scientific, and recreational features of the seashore.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to permit the transportation and disposal of domestic and industrial wastes within or through the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in accordance with standards established by the State of Oregon: *Provided*, That such disposal does not materially impair the scenic, scientific, and recreational features of the seashore.

Sec. 11. The Secretary may conduct such sand dune stabilization and erosion control

programs within the Oregon Dunes National Seashore as deemed necessary to insure the protection of man-made developments and the natural resources of the area, and he shall secure the advice of other Federal and State agencies to accomplish these purposes.

Sec. 12. No existing authority or responsibility of any Federal, State, or local governmental agency with respect to jurisdiction over and the construction, reconstruction, operation, and maintenance of any public highway shall be altered or affected by this Act or by the relocation of any such highway, but the Secretary may acquire jurisdiction over such highway by agreement with the administering agency pursuant to section 3 of this Act. In the event any such highway is relocated or reconstructed any increased cost attributable to the adoption of recommendations of the Secretary in any way therein shall be borne by funds available to him.

Sec. 13. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, except that no more than \$25,000,000 shall be appropriated for the acquisition of land and waters and improvements thereon, and interests therein, and incidental costs relating thereto, in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 14. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Subject matter: Proposed legislation to establish 3 national seashores (Cape Cod, Padre Island, and Oregon Dunes National Seashores)

Estimated additional man-years of civilian employment and expenditures for the 1st 5 years of proposed new or expanded programs

	1st year	2d year	3d year	4th year	5th year
Estimated additional man-years of civilian employment:					
Executive direction:					
Acquisition project manager.....	1.5	3.0	3	3.0	3
Assistant acquisition project manager.....	1.5	3.0	3	3.0	3
Administrative assistant.....	3.0	4.5	6	9.0	3
Stenographic and clerical.....	3.0	4.5	6	9.0	6
Superintendent.....	3.0	3.0	3	3.0	3
Assistant superintendent.....				3.0	3
Total.....	9.0	18.0	21	30.0	21
Administrative services:					
Clerical.....			3	6.0	6
Administrative aid.....		3.0	3	3.0	3
Total.....		3.0	6	9.0	9
Substantive:					
Chief ranger.....	1.0	1	1	3.0	3
Ranger.....	2.5	3.0	5	9.0	15
Lifeguards.....	2.0	6.0	8	12.0	15
Laborers and craftsmen.....	1.0	3.0	4	5.5	15
Engineer.....	1.5	3.0	3	3.0	3
Architect.....	1.0	3.0	3	3.0	3
Landscape architect.....	1.5	3.0	3	3.0	3
Appraisers.....	3.0	4.5	6	6.0	6
Stenographic.....	1.5	3.0	3	3.0	3
Total.....	14.0	29.5	36	47.5	57
Total, estimated additional man-years of civilian employment.....	23.0	50.5	63	86.5	87
Estimated additional expenditures:					
Personal services.....	\$124,200	\$272,700	\$340,200	\$467,100	\$469,800
All other.....	2,415,800	5,067,300	7,079,800	8,132,900	7,769,200
Total estimated additional expenditures.....	2,540,000	5,340,000	7,420,000	8,600,000	8,239,000
Estimated obligations:					
Land and property acquisition.....	4,200,000	5,000,000	5,700,000	5,400,000	4,700,000
Development.....	650,000	2,614,000	1,620,000	1,879,000	1,099,000
Operations (management, protection, and maintenance).....	158,000	344,000	426,000	622,000	754,000
Total estimated obligations.....	5,008,000	7,958,000	7,755,000	7,901,000	6,553,000

NUCLEAR TESTS AT THE SUMMIT

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, within a few days, President Eisenhower will depart for Paris, France, where he is to meet Prime Minister Macmillan, President de Gaulle, and Premier Khrushchev. Although there is no agenda for this conference, the Secretary of State and others have indicated a general assumption that disarmament in general and nuclear disarmament in particular will be discussed during the conference.

It is with a sense of seriousness and responsibility that I address the Senate on nuclear weapons tests policy, because I have been the majority party delegate-adviser to the conference from the Senate, because I am the only member of the majority party who is privileged to serve on both the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, because I am a member of the subcommittee on disarmament, and also because I have devoted a great deal of study to this problem. Constructive helpfulness with this complex subject, so fraught with danger, has been the earnest goal of my efforts.

Presumably, a discussion of nuclear disarmament at the summit conference will involve the proposal which President Eisenhower formally submitted to the Geneva Conference on February 11, 1960.

In the light of recent developments, including the testimony presented last week by a distinguished group of scientists to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the technical foundation for the President's proposal of February 11 has been seriously questioned, if not weakened. Moreover, the insistence of General de Gaulle that the curbing of delivery systems take priority over test suspension threatens disagreement among the Western Powers.

Notwithstanding the limitations of technical and political feasibility, now more clearly recognized than before, the fact remains that the President of the United States formally submitted this proposal. Moreover, the conference, which has now proceeded for nearly 18 months, was proposed by President Eisenhower. American prestige is heavily invested. Our moral position and U.S. leadership in the family of nations are involved.

As I understand it, the U.S. proposal of February 11 is specifically made conditional upon the installation of an International Control Commission of the type envisaged by the 1958 Geneva Conference of Experts. The proposed organization and mechanism for detection would be worldwide, with agreed provisions for other nations to be brought within the terms of the treaty. Implicit in our proposal is insistence that the proposed Control Commission and its operations at various stages and levels be allowed to function freely, to the full extent of its technical capability.

As I understand the February 11 proposal, it is conditioned upon reaching satisfactory agreement with the Soviets on the composition of the proposed

seven-nation Control Commission, the staffing of inspection teams and control stations, voting procedures within the Control Commission, fiscal arrangements and operations of the Commission and subdivisions thereof, scientific criteria deemed to justify an onsite inspection of a suspicious event, freedom of movement and access by inspection teams, and an agreement upon a formula relating to physical and scientific facts the number of annual veto-free onsite inspections.

Obviously, if inspection and control are to be effective, the composition and procedures of the governing Control Commission must be such as to avoid either direct or indirect veto of the Commission's action by any party. Unless the staffs of any Control Commission are truly international in character, they cannot be expected to perform impartially. If either a control station or an inspection team is dominated by nationals of the country in which the control post is located, we shall simply have a situation in which the nation is, in effect, inspecting itself.

As I further understand President Eisenhower's proposal, it would exclude from the proposed treaty nuclear weapons tests conducted in outer space which are beyond present technical capability of detection and all underground tests which do not produce a seismographic reading of 4.75 magnitude.

Viewed within the strict confines of consideration of nuclear weapons tests as an isolated issue, the President's proposal of February 11 is subject to serious question, indeed. But the issue cannot be viewed narrowly. It cannot be viewed solely in the context of weaponry. As I have said, the President has made the proposal. I am confident he did so in utmost good faith, and in so doing he is committed to the proposal. It must be viewed in the light of the various concessions which we have made as further evidence of our sincere desire to make progress in the direction of disarmament and peace and to improve the degree of trust and confidence existing among major world powers. Under all the circumstances, Mr. President, it is my opinion that a treaty negotiated within the terms of our February 11 proposal, as I understand it, will merit sympathetic and favorable consideration by the U.S. Senate. This, I concede, requires resolution of some doubts in the interest of unified U.S. policy and purpose at this crucial time.

I am concerned, however, that our proposal of February 11, may be regarded by some as a mere bargaining position, just as the Russian proposal of March 19 appears to represent a bargaining position from their point of view. I hope this is not the case. However, we must not bargain away the principle of adequate safeguards. If we should, in our zeal to reach an agreement, make additional concessions beyond those contained in the February 11 proposal, if we should, in other words, seek to negotiate an agreement lying somewhere between our proposal and

that submitted by the Russians on March 19—which was nebulous indeed in actual, practical procedure—the result of such negotiation must necessarily be subjected to the most searching scrutiny by the U.S. Senate in the discharge of its constitutional responsibility relative to the ratification of treaties.

These sentiments and views have been expressed today out of concern for the firmness and the prestige of President Eisenhower's proposal on nuclear weapons tests. It is my view that every reasonable assurance of unity that is possible, within bounds of duty and conscience, including the resolution of some doubts in favor of support of the President at this particular time, is desirable, if not seriously needed.

Perhaps I shall be permitted to say that, in my view, President Eisenhower would be well advised to avoid involvement of this issue in partisan politics.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I am very happy to be on the floor when the Senator is making this splendid address. I should like to indicate my strong view in support of his position that a nuclear treaty is possible, is feasible; that we should give the President the benefit of the doubt; that further concessions are undesirable, but that we in the Senate will support, as the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee said on the floor a little while ago, a good, sound treaty, because we know we have to take this menace of nuclear armament off the backs of the American people and see to it, if there is any way it can be done, that we and our children and grandchildren can live our lives out without the fear of nuclear fallout and without the fear of imminent destruction.

But I interrupted the Senator from Tennessee at this point because I particularly wanted to commend him for his assertion that President Eisenhower would be well advised to avoid involvement of this issue in partisan politics; and I view with something approaching alarm the Madison Avenue partisan statement that came out of Mr. Hagerty, at the White House, this morning suggesting that the Vice President would substitute for the President if the President felt he had to come back to this country in order to attend to his duties before the summit meeting had adjourned.

I particularly deplore the fact that this, in my judgment, slights the Secretary of State. I point out to my friend from Tennessee that during the 7 years and 4 months the Eisenhower administration has been in office there has never been a suggestion that anybody other than the Secretary of State should substitute for the President at a grave international conference.

I will ask my friend from Tennessee if it does not seem to him odd that this first insertion of the Vice President into our foreign affairs at the summit, where the lives and future safety of American citizens may well be involved, comes at

a time only 3 months before the Vice President of the United States is to become, so far as we can tell, the nominee of the Republican Party for President? Were it not for this timing, I do not have any doubt in my mind at all that we would not have had Mr. Hagerty's statement from the White House this morning. I should like to have my friend's comment on that matter.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I had not intended in this speech to comment upon this political episode, but since I have been requested to do so I shall express some brief views.

There has been a tendency in the administration to downgrade and to minimize the importance of this conference. A conference of the heads of state of the four great powers cannot in any realistic manner, as I see it, be viewed as unimportant or even relatively unimportant. I think it is of such supreme importance that a 2-day visit to Portugal could not possibly compare in importance with the presence of the President of the United States at the summit conference, if it is still under way.

Secondly, I would seriously doubt that General de Gaulle, Prime Minister Macmillan and Premier Khrushchev would care to continue a summit conference if the United States were represented by one without constitutional authority or responsibility.

It may well be that after the conference has proceeded for a few days problems will be referred to the foreign ministers. That practice has occurred heretofore. The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate has been informed this is expected to be a brief conference. I believe it has been described as a conference of 2, 3, or perhaps 4 days.

I think I must agree with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. I hope such a statement was not made by President Eisenhower, and I hope it was not made with his specific approval, for I feel it constitutes a "snub" to the Secretary of State. If the summit conference should be involved in partisan politics, I cannot believe the cause of peace would be served. I would seriously doubt our allies would appreciate it.

I believe that is the extent of the comment I care to make on this matter. I trust the summit conference and particularly the nuclear test issue, which is so vital and so dangerous, will not be involved in partisan politics.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the distinguished Senator from Tennessee made a very fine and searching speech on the Senate floor regarding the negotiations for the cessation of nuclear tests.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. His speech provoked a 3-hour debate. It was a valuable speech and a valuable debate.

I am glad that the Senator is speaking again on this subject. His speech, as I understand it, is directed toward unify-

ing the Senate, with the administration, regarding a nuclear treaty. I agree with what the Senator has said; I agree with him that we have gone about as far as we can in our proposals and should not make concessions. I commend the Senator. His speech is of great value.

If the Senator will permit me to make a further comment—

Mr. GORE. Before the Senator proceeds to another point, I should like to thank the Senator for his generosity. The able senior Senator from Kentucky not only did me the honor of listening to my more extended speech on this subject, but also he and I and our wives have engaged in earnest personal conversation on this subject. The senior Senator from Kentucky has knowledge that I have personally resolved doubts in favor of the position I have taken today, because I feel it is in the national interest to give the maximum degree of unified support to the President as he goes forth on this great mission.

Mr. COOPER. I am aware of the Senator's purpose. That is one of the reasons I commend the Senator. I know, as the Senator from Tennessee knows so well because of his work in this field, that there are areas of testing in space and underground where it would be very difficult to determine whether nuclear tests were conducted even though an agreement can be made.

In weighing the value of a treaty against these uncertainties, the Senator is saying, and I agree, we should favor such an agreement, if reasonable inspection is assured, to move away from the awful nuclear threat which confronts the world.

I observe my friend the senior Senator from Pennsylvania is present in the Chamber. If the Senator from Tennessee will permit, I should like to address myself to the subject which the Senator from Pennsylvania mentioned; that is, the statement made about the President and the Vice President.

First, I believe great significance has been placed upon the summit meeting by the President of the United States. We sometimes forget that it was the President of the United States who tendered the invitation to Mr. Khrushchev for the summit meeting. And as has been developed heretofore in debate, there have been thorough and careful preparations for the summit meeting. A recent evidence is the series of talks in which the President has been engaged with the heads of state of our allies.

I do not believe anyone doubts or questions the desire of the President to achieve favorable results at the summit meeting. Everyone understands the issues and the difficulties involved; yet there is great hope that results may come from the meeting—some decision that will move toward settlement of the issues between the allies and Soviet Russia, some relaxation of the tensions which could bring about war. Certainly this is the hope and the purpose of the President of the United States.

The Senator from Tennessee's speech is designed to remove partisanship at this time, and to bring about a higher degree of unity.

But I must say to my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who knows how much regard I have for him, that I do not believe any good purpose is served by ascribing to the President some kind of political motivation, if it is true that he said that in the event he could not attend all meetings of the summit conference, the Vice President would represent our country.

I have known Secretary of State Herter for 15 or 16 years. I share with other Members of the Senate a high regard for him. He is an able and dedicated Secretary of State, a man of courage and judgment. I am sure he will be at the summit; and I am sure that his advice and great influence will be used to the fullest.

I have no means of knowing whether or not Mr. Hagerty is correct as to what the President intends to do. But as far as I am concerned, I would think it well if the Vice President were also present. He is a man of great ability. He has demonstrated his ability to meet, on even terms, the Russian representatives, even Mr. Khrushchev with whom we must deal. I think it is wrong at this time to begin to ascribe political motivations to the President of the United States, upon questions which may well be the greatest we shall face this year. I say this with all regard for my friend from Pennsylvania, but I mean it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield in order that I may reply briefly to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Let me say to my good friend from Kentucky, who knows the affection in which I hold him, that it was not I, and it was not the Senator from Tennessee, who brought partisan politics into the discussion of the summit meeting. It was Mr. James Hagerty, who issued a statement this morning. I did not charge the President of the United States with political motivation. I said—and the Senator from Tennessee joined me in the comment—that I hoped the President of the United States would repudiate this obvious and clear interjection of partisan politics into a matter from which it should be excluded.

I am as interested as is my friend from Kentucky in the unification of the country behind the President, in terms of the summit conference. I think the President has an obligation to keep politics out of this question. I am convinced that whoever made the statement from the White House this morning deliberately interjected partisan politics into it for purely partisan political advantage.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I hold to my position. I do not know whether the President made the statement referred to or not; but if he did, I certainly would not ascribe to him any political motivation.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, following the colloquy between my distinguished friends the senior Senator from Pennsylvania and the senior Senator from Kentucky, I again express the hope that neither the summit conference nor the current nuclear weapon test conference will become involved in partisan politics.

In expressing that hope, I am not charging that such a thing has happened. I must say, in all candor, however, that in the cloakrooms today the common interpretation of the announcement from the White House this morning is that the announcement was politically motivated.

That raises a question. The White House has no tongue. It is the inanimate residence of the President. Of course, the Presidency has become institutionalized. But there is really only one man who can be the spokesman of the White House. That is not Mr. Hagerty. It is the President of the United States; and I express serious doubt that President Eisenhower either made the statement referred to or authorized it, although, like the senior Senator from Kentucky, I do not know.

Unfortunately, the question of nuclear weapon tests was given partisan treatment in 1956.

It was then that Governor Stevenson suggested that the United States take the lead in curbing contamination of the world's atmosphere by seeking an international agreement for cessation of large hydrogen bomb tests. This suggestion, it is true, was made in the course of a political campaign. But it was a serious suggestion, as we can all now agree, seriously advanced. It was dismissed out of hand by President Eisenhower, who was then a candidate opposing Governor Stevenson, and who characterized it as a "theatrical gesture." Vice President Nixon, then wearing the "old" Nixon hat, said of it:

If he [Stevenson] continues to pursue this course, the American people would be taking a fearful risk with their own security if they were to elect him President.

Less than 2 years later, President Eisenhower had reversed his position 180 degrees. It was on August 22, 1958, that the President proposed a conference between Great Britain, Russia, and the United States for the negotiation of a treaty to suspend nuclear weapons tests. I say this was a 180-degree reversal because the Stevenson proposal was rejected, not on grounds having to do with inspection and control of an agreement, but on the grounds that further testing of nuclear weapons was required in the interest of national security. As late as December 1957, the President still adhered to this position strongly and so stated in a letter to Prime Minister Nehru of India. It is a matter of fact that neither our own people nor the people of the world have been given the reasons for the President's complete change of mind.

This is not to say that the President made a mistake in reversing his position. Indeed, the basic decision to seek an agreement on this subject was correct. Even in doing so, though, the administration made a serious mistake in assuming that an international control system to monitor a comprehensive test ban agreement was then technically and politically feasible. This assumption was based upon the byproduct results of a single underground test explosion which had been conducted for an altogether different purpose.

It is strange to note that at the time the President made his proposal in which the assumption of technical feasibility of detection of a comprehensive test ban agreement was implicit, additional underground tests from which specific information was to be obtained were already scheduled. Nevertheless, the conference was called and our position was taken without waiting for this information to be properly analyzed. When the results of the U.S. Hardtack Series were analyzed, the technical facts and assumptions upon which our position had been taken were clearly shown to be unrealistic and incorrect.

From the first day of the Conference, which I attended, until now, the Russians have treated the Conference as an exercise in propaganda. It is my view that the administration has been quite remiss in its failure, after 18 months of negotiations, to pin the Russians down to the acceptance or rejection of an adequate system of inspection and control to verify observance of the provisions of a treaty, which President Eisenhower has repeatedly and rightly said is a necessary part of a treaty.

Upon my return from Geneva in November of 1958, I reported to President Eisenhower my belief that the Russians had two basic objectives: One, to prevent further nuclear weapons development through tests by the United States and, two, to outlaw the use of nuclear weapons. I reported further my view that Russia sought to achieve either or both of these goals without accepting any realistic system of inspection and detection within the Soviet Union.

Since November 1, 1958, we have given the Russians a de facto ban on all nuclear weapons tests without any inspection whatsoever. There are strong indications that this will continue. Meanwhile, we have no assurance that Russia is refraining from all tests.

The Russians, as I have said, have taken the fullest propaganda advantage of the Conference. Time after time they have reaped a harvest of political propaganda, anticipating and foxing us over and over again.

For the second time now, developments in science have revealed our assumption of the capability of detection techniques to be overly optimistic. The Russians are embarrassed not at all by such new scientific information. After all, they have only accepted inspection in principle. By them it is treated as an academic subject. They have steadfastly resisted agreement to permit even one single inspection team to make one single inspection in the Soviet Union, no matter how many suspicious events may occur.

But, Mr. President, even our mistakes have emphasized our sincerity and good faith. The mistakes are history. We cannot recall them. What we can do and what we must do is to take a realistic view of the situation which exists, undertaking to make the most of it while being sure that we do not make it worse.

I should like to close as I began. The President of the United States will soon cross the water's edge to represent all

the American people at this important Conference. It is in the hope of strengthening his hand and encouraging firm adherence to his nuclear weapons test proposal of February 11 by all Western Powers that I have spoken.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I commend my friend from Tennessee on what I believe to be a most statesmanlike address. I should like to associate myself with his conclusions, particularly with his last paragraph, that the President of the United States should and ought to see to it that he does represent all the American people at this important Conference. I am confident that when he does so, all the American people will support him.

I notice that my friend has before him the joint communique issued after the Macmillan-Eisenhower conference a short time ago. I wonder if my friend is in accord with me, that there is nothing inconsistent in the splendid speech he has made with the joint communique issued by Mr. Macmillan and President Eisenhower at that time.

Mr. GORE. First, I thank my distinguished friend for his generosity. I do have before me the communique issued by Prime Minister Macmillan and President Eisenhower after their talks at Camp David.

In reply to the able Senator, I should like briefly to review the points made in the communique, which the Senator will recall was referred to on the floor of the Senate by me on the very day it was issued. I commended and applauded President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Macmillan upon steering the ship of negotiations back into the proper channel and putting first things first.

What is the first point in the communique? After the first two paragraphs, which are more or less a preface, this is stated:

When the Geneva Conference began 17 months ago, there was reason to hope from the preliminary scientific discussions which had preceded it that there would be no insuperable technical or scientific difficulties in establishing an effective control system capable of detecting nuclear tests of all kinds.

Subsequently, however, it appeared from further scientific research that in our present state of knowledge there are great technical problems involved in setting up a control system which would be effective in detecting underground nuclear tests below a certain size.

Mr. President, I submit that that is a review of the assumption of technical feasibility made by the administration in August 1958, which was rendered unrealistic by later tests and information. I believe the same point is made in my speech that was made in the communique. I am sure that the joint communique makes it much better. I read further from the communique:

It is, however, the sincere hope of the President and the Prime Minister that an agreed program of coordinated scientific research, undertaken by the three countries, will lead in time to a solution of this problem.

I made such a proposal to the President in November 1958. It has now

been proposed to the Russians in Geneva, upon instructions to the British and American delegations by Prime Minister Macmillan and President Eisenhower. I am advised by the Department of State that it expects the Soviet reply within the week. I hope the reply will be favorable. This would be a constructive step. If, together, the nuclear powers could solve some of these technical problems of detection, it would not only promote the conclusion of a treaty, but would also promote mutual confidence between the powers.

I read further from the joint communique:

Meanwhile, the President and the Prime Minister believe that progress can be made toward their ultimate objective of a comprehensive agreement.

There is nothing in disagreement with my statement there. I continue to read:

They have agreed that much has been accomplished in these Geneva negotiations toward this objective.

They point out that in the effort to achieve a treaty of arms control, there are a number of important specific problems to be resolved. These include the questions of an adequate quota of on-site inspections, the composition of the control commission, control post staffing, and voting matters, as well as arrangements for peaceful purposes detonations.

I wish to call to the attention of the Senator the fact that after the conclusion of a treaty such as the joint communique describes, and after there is a joint program of research, and after definite means of detection are agreed to and in operation, then, and only then, according to the communique, is the moratorium to be considered and made operative.

Mr. CLARK. If I may interrupt the Senator, I should think not only after the treaty has been negotiated, but after it has been ratified by the Senate.

Mr. GORE. This is not made plain in the communique.

The Prime Minister and the President have agreed that as soon as this treaty has been signed—

I believe that does make it plain—

and arrangements made for a coordinated research program for the purpose of progressively improving control methods for events below a seismic magnitude of 4.75, they will be ready to institute a voluntary moratorium of agreed duration on nuclear weapons tests below that threshold, to be accomplished by unilateral declaration of each of the three powers.

I had not presumed to discuss the moratorium which it is proposed will be accomplished by Executive order of the President of the United States after the conclusion of a treaty, and after a joint program of scientific research on test detection is undertaken.

After all, the Senate does not consider an executive direction to an agency of the Government as it does a treaty. In my speech today, I have referred to—and I had intended to refer to—the terms of a treaty which, under the Constitution, must come to the Senate for ratification.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with everything the Senator has said about the importance of separating a treaty from the executive act of a moratorium, but I wonder if the Senator would not agree with me that it might well be unwise for the President, acting in his executive capacity, to agree to a moratorium for a fixed period prior to the ratification of a treaty by the Senate.

I assume that a moratorium on a day-to-day or a month-to-month basis, pending ratification, might well be desirable; but I for one would hesitate to indicate that, in my individual judgment, it would be a matter of course for the Senate to ratify such a treaty in the face of an agreement on a moratorium for a fixed period of a substantial length of time.

Mr. GORE. Of course, a moratorium which is tied specifically to a treaty, although not an integral part of the treaty, would of necessity be considered by the Senate. To state it another way, the Senate would, of necessity, consider the treaty in light of such moratorium or other internationally agreed positions as might be closely related to it.

In this instance, it seems to me that we are talking of a hypothetical occurrence. The President and the Prime Minister have placed first things first: The conclusion of a treaty with adequate safeguards for those tests covered by the treaty; the initiation of a joint program to conduct experiments and research in developing means of detection; and then, after those things are concluded, the question of a moratorium would be in order. I hardly know how to discuss the subject, because we have not reached that stage yet.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator from Tennessee. I was intending only to throw out a possible caveat, which I will now make more specific by calling attention to the sentence in the United States-British statement which refers to an agreement, as soon as the treaty has been signed and arrangements made for a coordinated research program and continues that there would thereupon be a readiness to institute a voluntary moratorium, for an agreed duration, on nuclear weapons tests below that threshold. I could have wished that the communique had used the word "ratified" rather than "signed." I am still of the view that a unilateral declaration should not be in the first instance for a period or a duration longer than it could be anticipated it would take the Senate to deal with the ratification of a treaty.

Mr. GORE. I conclude by saying there is much merit to the position taken by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. I shall not presume to reach a judgment upon a moratorium which has not been agreed upon. Much would depend upon the nature of the tests involved in a moratorium agreement; likewise the duration of a moratorium, the effect it might have upon the operation of the International Control Commission, and the effect it might have upon the treaty.

I shall, of necessity, as I am certain the senior Senator from Pennsylvania will do, reserve judgment upon this

question, expressing faith that President Eisenhower and his administration will be prudent in this regard, as in others.

I yield the floor.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1960

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3058) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the action taken by the Committee on Foreign Relations on S. 3058, the Mutual Security Act of 1960.

I do not, it will be noticed, leap to my feet ablaze with excitement and enthusiasm. My eyes do not sparkle with happy anticipation. Instead, I rise with the restraining weight of a heavy responsibility and the duty unavoidably attached to my position as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee pulling at my shoulders. Further, I do so in the oppressive knowledge that no one in the Senate has an assignment which is less likely to arouse the sympathetic interest of the American public.

I am well aware of the fact that the mutual security program is no more popular—or, to be accurate, no better understood—among the people of my State than it is in the Nation generally. How much more pleasant it would be for them and for me if their junior Senator were today reporting from committee a public works project easily seen as of immediate and direct benefit to Arkansas. How much more entertaining it would be if I were appearing on their television screens in the guise of St. George lustily belaboring the scaly elements of evil abroad in our land, or in a burst of patriotic fervor denouncing all those benighted "furriners" who have different ideas from ours about how to organize or manage their affairs.

Yet I can and do take the stoic's comfort to be derived from the performance of a stern but vital duty which is essential to the security and well-being of Arkansas, the Nation, and the entire free world.

I think my attitude is fully comprehensible to my colleagues. Perhaps it will be even more widely understood if I compare it with the average citizen's failure to become joyful over his life insurance policy. He does not pull out his policy ever so often and look at it with tender affection. In fact, his quarterly or annual payments may be a source of distress and bitter complaint. The family man, nevertheless, feels that to reduce or dispend with that policy would jeopardize that which is dearest to his heart, the security of his family.

Mr. President, I believe that the mutual security program is the insurance policy indispensable to this country as it carries out its international responsibilities.

I would admit that Mr. Average Citizen, while seldom enthusiastic about his personal insurance policy, might well be pleased and moved by the opportunity to attach clauses which would give him much better coverage at roughly the same cost. Many of my colleagues joined me in expressing the hope that

this year's mutual security program would come to us from President Eisenhower with just such clauses in evidence. Indeed, many of us in the last session worked hard, albeit unsuccessfully, to make the changes in the bill conceded to be necessary, even by high administration officials. We tried to give the program continuity and the ability to plan for the future. We tried to make efficient administration possible, but we failed—at least temporarily.

Unfortunately, the mutual security program for 1960 in many ways resembles a plate of warmed-over grits. In the near absence of initiative, originality, and long-term provisions in the bill before us—symptomatic of a tired administration, as well as of election year dictates—it is not surprising that the Foreign Relations Committee, rebuffed for its energetic pains last year, could not muster much fresh enthusiasm for what is essentially a holding operation.

At the same time, I would fully support the view that there is much nourishment in warmed-over grits, and that many would find them palatable and comforting if no more exciting fare were available.

Having, I hope, clarified my overall position, I should like now to recall briefly some of the arguments about the bill before us. My colleagues will be glad to know that I do not intend to give a long list of facts and figures and a point-by-point recital of committee actions and changes. These are fully described and justified in the excellent committee report on their desks. Instead, I want to make a few general observations about the basic nature of the mutual security bill.

With a slight amendment, let me recall a phrase of Plutarch's:

It is a difficult task, O citizens, to make speeches to the [pocketbook], which has no ears.

I would add, "no eyes" either, for the justification of a foreign-aid program has been spelled out in detail in myriad publications for more than a decade. The arguments have been presented and wholeheartedly subscribed to by all our Presidents, Secretaries of State and Defense, Joint Chiefs of Staff, and other high officials. As was noted in the other body a few days ago, every declared presidential candidate at the present time, as well as the undeclared possibilities for the nomination, so far as I am aware, is fully committed to the importance of foreign aid. Yet each year it seems that the same fundamental arguments have to be presented to those who either fail to use their eyes and ears or refuse to believe them.

Why there should still be so little public understanding of the mutual security program is only a partial mystery. Frankly, I do not believe it unfair to assign some of the blame to the press and other information media. Very few newspapers around the country find it to their interest to pursue educational functions. Yet many are only too happy to seize on an isolated minor instance of waste or inefficiency and use it to imply that it typifies the whole foreign-aid program, which should

therefore be abolished. This is rather like having the stockholders of a big corporation demand liquidation because 2 out of 100 employees in a certain category are not performing well. Then there is the classic case of the headlined big "scandal"—we had an instance of that last year—and the tiny admission of error on the next edition's back page. I would also add that few people seem to be aware of the continuing force of the mutual security provision which prohibits undue executive branch efforts to secure public understanding of the foreign-aid program here at home.

Whatever the reasons, the fact remains that there is little understanding, or there is misunderstanding, of the mutual security program in many areas of the national scene. I am not so naive as to think that an attempt to counter the usual criticisms with either argument or logic will go far toward converting convinced opponents of foreign aid. But neither am I so discouraged that I shall not try to stimulate interest in the committee report among those who have as yet refrained from taking a firm position.

Before passing on to what I would consider more important factors, let me give at least a hurried note to the charges and epithets traditionally hurled at the mutual security bill. There is always a sort of tragic Greek chorus ready to break into its moaning cries of "giveaway," inefficiency, blunders and baloney, waste and woe.

First, let us consider the "giveaway" charge. As in years past, my colleagues will find in the voluminous record of committee hearings testimony to the effect that roughly 80 percent of all mutual security funds are directly spent in the United States, and that over 500,000 jobs for American citizens have been created by the program. These estimates, made by nongovernmental experts in 1957, are still applicable and are unrefuted. But how much publicity is given and how much attention is paid to this evidence, and what is the response? One elected representative of the American people, when recently confronted with this information, figuratively folded his arms and stuck out his lower lip, and literally said "I do not believe it." There was no further argument, and there will be none now on that score. I do not mean to imply that this is the principal justification for this program, but it is on this one score.

Next, what about waste and inefficiency? It seems that even the strongest supporters of the mutual security program these days must go through a ritualistic ceremony of admitting and deploring the element of truth in these charges, pledging themselves anew to a crusade for improvement, and then stating somewhat ruefully that they will vote for the bill. I have considerable sympathy for this reaction, since I am far from believing that every project is equally essential and that the program now before us is the best that could be created. In fact, I know that it is not.

Yet I doubt that this defensiveness is actually necessary. I doubt that our

constituents really see us or administration officials as playboys of the roaring twenties frantically scattering taxpayers' money to the winds. I doubt that we need constantly to protest that we do not condone ineptitude and careless handling of money. And I fear that by catering to the critics' obsession with an acknowledged small amount of waste, we invite at least two dangerous reactions: one, we allow attention to be diverted from really important deficiencies in the aid program; and, two, we misrepresent Americans as being more interested in the accounting process than in preserving national security and benefiting humanity.

If anyone does not have enough imagination to comprehend the difficulties and inevitable trial-and-error methods involved in an attempt to give a primitive jungle or desert country a chance to preserve its independence, then no words of mine will serve to impart that imagination. If anyone believes that his townsmen and neighbors, in serving our country overseas, through some mysterious alchemy lose all ideals and virtues, and become bumbling wastrels, then I can only commiserate with that person for his low opinion of his fellow men, and perhaps of himself. If anyone thinks that the pure application of American business methods will lift the foreign-aid program into a paradise of efficiency, I would ask him if he has never known of a fellow citizen who went out to buy a new automobile or television set, and found he had bought a "lemon." If anyone considers that the U.S. Congress has discovered the touchstone of inspired planning and absolute efficiency, let him take a windswept ride on one of our impressive new subway cars, with wheels designed for a dead-straight track, and let him listen to the reproaches of those wheels as they shudder and groan through a serpentine tunnel and grind themselves into dust. But I have not heard anyone advocate the abolition of the Senate merely because of that glaring instance of ineptitude.

The sad truth, Mr. President, is that human enterprises are no more perfectible than the imperfect humans who conceive of them and carry them out. This fact happily does not in the least deter mankind in its constant battle for what it believes is progress and a better world. It has not discouraged a campaign for improved administration of the mutual security program; indeed, our committee report, as well as that of the other body, cites marked improvements in the program.

However, insistence on an absolute can be carried to the point of causing barren destruction. Who can help but be emotionally stirred when a self-proclaimed supporter of the principle of mutual security rises to declaim righteously and to vote against the program so long as even \$1 is wasted? Yet surely a more mature judgment would ask whether that \$1 is to be saved by throwing the whole program overboard.

As I have suggested, more important drawbacks exist in the mutual security program and are of a character different from what the usual criticisms indicate. These drawbacks can generally be

classified under the charge of adopting short-term solutions for long-range problems. Each year we go through the same time-consuming and exhausting process of examining the program with a fine-tooth comb. And each year the resulting legislation becomes more complex and cumbersome as friend and foe alike hasten to add just those few more provisions that will really add up to a magical formula for preventing any waste whatsoever. In the process of detailed argument, the administration becomes more and more committed to stand by and carry out plans that events may prove to be ill adapted to meet and overcome rapidly shifting local situations.

Although few programs ever undertaken by any government at any time have been so carefully scrutinized and checked, congressional critics insist upon diverting our attention from the policy issues, which properly should be our main concern, to a narrow concentration upon administrative practices. The goal here seems to be to make us over into management experts rather than shapers of foreign policy. The committee has manfully struggled to elevate its work to the proper plane—especially with a view toward planning for the longer-range future—but has made little headway against administration timidity and congressional suspicions.

Now let us look at two interrelated arguments advanced even by those who have been counted among the advocates of the program in past years. I believe these arguments are worthy of being viewed more seriously and sympathetically.

First, there is the natural reaction of many of those who are sick and tired of being forced to spend weeks each year in tedious and unrewarded examination of a program that seems to bring us no closer to a lasting solution, who believe that certain portions of the program are deeply mired in a rut, and who are convinced that a new and fresh approach is imperative. This reaction can take the form of willingness to consider large punitive cuts and sweeping administrative changes in an attempt to compel a fundamental reconsideration of the program.

Perhaps an answer by analogy can be drawn from the soap-opera case of the disgruntled husband who, after nearly a decade of marriage, is demanding that his tired, almost slovenly wife either make herself over or go home to mother. Well, the lady has had a rough time of it over the past few years; she has borne children, washed and mended, slaved over the hot stove—burning several culinary efforts in the process—and has generally safeguarded the security and well-being of the home. Quite rightly, she feels she has done yeoman service and should not be expected to look exactly like the girl he married. With the best intentions, she just has not the strength to do all she should; surely matters will be different next year, when the children are older and there will be some part-time help. Now if friend husband thinks about the alternatives with a little clarity, he almost certainly will take

a more understanding position. The real danger, however, is that some seductive charmer he might meet in the local tavern will turn him from the path of duty and good sense.

That charmer shows up in the second argument, which points to apparent or hoped-for changes in the world scene that might permit us to relax our overall efforts a bit, or at least to dispense with some of our very costly defense establishments and arrangements. My own view is that there has been no basic change in the cold war problem which justifies any letting down of our guard. Indeed, the Berlin situation is more than sufficient confirmation of that view.

My colleagues are aware that the committee last year, disturbed at the apparent scarcity of long-range foreign policy thinking and planning in the Government, arranged with private groups and institutions for a series of studies which would provide the basis for some fresh independent thought about the global scene. One of the best of these studies is the one prepared on the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe by a Columbia-Harvard research group. To place the bill before us in the proper context, I should like to quote the following excerpts from that report:

The evidence seems to suggest that these internal changes (in the U.S.S.R.) are not likely, at least over the next decade or so, to lead to real normalization of Soviet relations with the rest of the world * * * the position of the Soviet leadership promises to remain strong and its commitment to Communist goals unimpaired.

As a consequence, if present trends continue, a further increase of Soviet power and influence is to be expected.

Dealing with the Soviet challenge should not become an exclusive preoccupation of American policy. While it is of vital importance that we steadily take the measure of the Soviet challenge, without becoming distracted by the day-to-day ups and downs of Soviet "atmospheric" changes, the central focus of our policy should be the political growth and economic improvement of the non-Communist world. This forward movement, inspired by a vision of democratic progress, is essential to the creation of a world environment favorable to the survival and development of free institutions. It is also the course of action most likely to lead to a modification of Soviet policies over the long run.

It is vital that the United States not allow an imbalance of military power to develop in the Soviet favor, not only in the interest of the maintenance of peace but also in order to protect the non-Communist world against a process of piecemeal disintegration.

It is necessary that the United States and its allies be prepared to use a range of instrumentalities—military, political, and economic—to insure against the further extension of Soviet power and influence.

Coordinate with these measures, the United States should be continuously prepared to explore through negotiation the settlement of outstanding problems between the Soviet Union and the non-Communist world, without either undue expectations or sterile pessimism.

Finally, there is the requirement on which all others depend: the development of a public understanding sufficiently informed and mature to be willing to support heavy costs and sacrifices without the stimulation of crises or bellicosity, without wild alternations between optimism and pessimism. This is the source of strength which would

make it possible for a democratic society to preserve the essential qualities of its democratic life while it mounts the degree of mobilization necessary to deal with the mortal, and continuing, challenge of the Soviet system.

I do not believe that we shall find a better and more succinct appreciation of the world we face than the study which I have just quoted.

Now let us take one concrete example of the importance of supporting a mutual security program which will give our Government tools not only to deal with the Soviet challenge but also to support initiatives in the uncommitted areas of the world. I invite your careful attention to an article by Hamilton Fish Armstrong in the New York Times magazine of April 17 on the new African country of Guinea. Mr. Armstrong, the respected editor of Foreign Affairs, is extremely knowledgeable and no alarmist. Yet the picture he gives of the situation in Guinea fully bears out his article's title, "Disturbing Portent for Africa."

It is clear that, through the permissive inertia and mistakes of the West, the Soviet bloc has moved with great speed into a small West African country which it threatens to dominate and turn into a base for further operations in the area. Guinea now depends almost entirely on Soviet credits of \$35 million and on bloc technicians for its future development. It has severed its ties with the French franc zone, and roughly 80 percent of its trade is with the Soviet bloc—whereas formerly an even greater percentage of trade was with the West. Mr. Armstrong does not suggest that President Toure is a Communist, nor does he question the sincerity of Toure's determination to keep Guinea neutral and uninterested in the cold war. However, as the article says:

It is doubtful whether he and most of his ministers realize as yet just how tightly they are being caught in the spider's web.

After pointing out the implications for the rest of Africa if the Soviet-supported venture becomes a success in Guinean eyes, Mr. Armstrong in the following passage concludes that our Government is not organized to cope with such developments and strongly criticizes both Congress and the executive branch.

The fact is that, although the American system of government serves us pretty well at home, it is completely helpless to deal with a whole series of situations confronting us around the world.

Congress is unwilling to trust the executive with sufficient free funds to enable it to act promptly in critical situations. It refuses to appropriate ahead so that there can be long-term planning. When Government funds are available, they are swathed in red-tape.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

MR. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I happen to believe that Armstrong lets

the Executive off too easily—what is the President's contingency fund for, if not for emergencies?—but there is no doubt in my mind that he is right on the essentials.

I do not raise this as a plea for dramatic action with respect to Guinea; the time for emergency moves has given way to a need for careful appraisal accompanied with the readiness to act swiftly whenever appropriate. Rather I want to underline the necessity of supporting the mutual security program before us, minimal and cumbersome though it may be in some respects. We will not this year obtain the improvements a number of us wholeheartedly desire. Nevertheless, many of the tools are here if the Executive only chooses to use them, hopefully with vigor and courage.

Now, before concluding, I owe my colleagues at least a very brief résumé of committee action on S. 3058. First, let me remind Senators that the administration's request for \$1.454 billion in its authorization bill leaves out of account the \$2 billion requested for military assistance and \$700 million for the Development Loan Fund. Authorization was provided last year by the Congress for these two categories. The committee did, however, limit military assistance, other than training, for Latin America to a ceiling \$2 million below that proposed by the administration.

The bill as reported by the committee contains total authorizations of \$1,425,500,000—a reduction of \$29,400,000 in the administration's request. Most of the cut was made in defense support, a category that the committee has long believed should be reduced as quickly and stringently as considerations of military security will permit. Special assistance was cut by \$8.5 million. Finally, \$400,000 less than requested was earmarked for the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, because the committee considered that his program should be phased out, rather than shifted to a new group of refugees.

In an attempt to stimulate a solution to the Palestine refugee problem, Congress for 2 years has directed that a percentage of the authorized appropriation for the refugee program should be reserved for repatriation or resettlement. This proviso has had absolutely no effect. The committee therefore has proposed to repeal it, to provide for the return of \$6.25 million in accumulated funds to the Treasury, and to direct the President to make specific recommendations next year for dealing with the problem. The net effect of the committee's action on this section is to reduce the administration request by \$3 million.

While the bill contains little that is new, there are two or three provisions which should be noted here. The sense of Congress is expressed that the Development Loan Fund should assist savings and loan type institutions and guarantee private U.S. capital available for housing investments in Latin America. As requested by the administration, authority is provided to use funds for the Indus Basin development under the

supervision of the International Bank and in accordance with the Bank's standards and procedures. Lastly, contained within the illustrative program for special assistance is a provision for a \$20 million special program for tropical Africa. The committee welcomes this evidence of growing attention to the needs of Africa, and hopes that the program will be administered in such a way as to encourage greater regional integration.

Let me close by addressing exhortations to three groupings among my colleagues.

First, to those who intend to vote for S. 3058 in the belief that it is a good, sound bill and just what the doctor ordered, I pay my sincere respects with a somewhat wistful admiration for such consistency and faith.

To those who recognize that the doctor ordered it, but disagree with the nature of the prescription and want to change doctors, I would recommend the old La Guardia slogan, "patience and fortitude." I would also tentatively suggest that the medicine not be taken through clenched teeth for fear of spilling enough to require the administration of a supplemental dose.

Finally, to those who firmly believe that the mutual security bill is a monster to be slashed ruthlessly, I would invite them to look at page 25 of the printed hearings. They will find that the repository of all foreign policy wisdom—I am, of course, referring to the Bureau of the Budget—has already hacked some \$750 million from the departmental requests with its "vorpal blade." Surely those colleagues will not wish to prevent the bleeding Jabberwock from staggering through one more year.

Now, Mr. President, a final word about the aid program in Korea. As reflected in the hearings and as stated in the committee's report, the Foreign Relations Committee was gravely concerned over the situation in Korea prior to the most recent and serious outbreak of rioting. It is to be hoped that the change in government in Korea will be accompanied by political reforms which will bring a greater measure of freedom and stability to that unhappy country.

I noticed in this afternoon's newspaper that the new Acting President, Huh, was quoted as saying, "I believe there is waste of American aid funds and improper management." That is not news to the committee, but I am glad to see the Acting President of Korea has now recognized it.

Again to quote the committee's report, there seems no generally acceptable alternative to continuing the aid program in Korea. On the other hand, the recent events in that country raise a question, which is of wider application, as to the long-term effectiveness of an aid program continued in the absence of an atmosphere of expanding basic freedoms. This is a question which I think should be looked into before another mutual security bill comes before the Senate.

Among other things, thought should be given to the provocative questions raised by Conlon Associates in their study on Asia prepared at the request of the

Committee on Foreign Relations. These questions are:

1. What form of aid is most conducive to stimulating indigenous energies and capital formation?

2. To what extent should assistance be geared to long-range plans and what should be the American responsibility for checking the validity and progress of such plans?

3. What is the proper balance between military and economic aid, in terms of the security and welfare of Korea?

EXHIBIT I

[From the New York Times, Apr. 17, 1960]

DISTURBING PORTENT FOR AFRICA

(By Hamilton Fish Armstrong)

CONAKRY, GUINEA.—In a world preoccupied with summit conferences, the new nation of Guinea does not loom large, but developments there are—and should be—of great interest as an example of how Communist alertness can capitalize on Western errors and inertia. For the Soviet bloc is operating in Guinea. And if things progress as Moscow hopes and intends, Guinea can become a cancer that would affect the whole of west Africa.

Almost the only certain fact about the situation in Guinea today is that its economy is coming to be dominated more and more by the Soviet Union and its satellites. The Soviets have given the Government \$35 million of credits on the easiest sort of terms. Part is being used to buy Russian sugar and cement, East German flour and matches, Czechoslovak cotton materials and shoes. The stock of French goods is drying up; the showrooms for French and American cars are bare, and Russian and Czech cars are taking their place.

Formerly, Guinea's foreign trade was more than 80 percent with the West. Now the proportions have been reversed—80 percent with the Soviet bloc, 20 percent with the West.

The Russian sugar is not very sweet, the East German flour makes tough bread, but all is cheap, and any resentment at the gradual deterioration in standards will come slowly and only from people of little influence. As a whole, the country is united behind President Sékou Touré and his policy of going it alone politically, come what may economically.

For the most part the Soviet credits are being used to finance an amazing variety of projects that will build up local pride and gratitude.

The airstrip at Conakry is being lengthened to 3 kilometers to take jets; already several Soviet-built Czech planes have landed here on practice flights, and soon one will be able to fly direct from Prague, via Zurich and Rabat, to Conakry (and before long on to Accra) on a frequent schedule. Guinea and Ghana have taken the first steps toward confederation; the ability to fly between Conakry and Accra several times a week in an hour and a half (at present it is a 6-hour flight once a week) will tend to cement what has so far been a rather artificial union.

The road to the airport is to be made into a four-lane modern highway. Fifty modern Hungarian buses are in service, a great popular convenience and delight. A polytechnic institute is to be built. At present there is no daily paper in Conakry (or indeed any regular periodical except a Government mimeographed news sheet); this lack will be remedied by a new East German printing plant. A shoe factory is also to be built. And there is to be a sports arena seating 25,000. Conakry is stuffed with the Communist engineers and technicians engaged on these undertakings; and as three new hotels also are planned, the number presumably will rapidly increase.

Each of these enterprises is needed and will bring applause. Each will put the Soviet Union out of pocket. But the overall book-keeping, Moscow figures, will show a colossal profit. Would not \$35 million be a cheap price to pay for a country?

President Touré was undoubtedly sincere when he said during his trip to the United States last November that he was determined to preserve Guinea's neutrality, and he has reiterated the same determination to me here vehemently. But he does not believe in exclusive dealings and is not interested in the ideologies of those who offer to help. Where there is need—and there is need for everything—he takes what is offered if he believes it is without strings. Taken one by one, the strings may seem slender, and Mr. Touré does not stop, perhaps, to consider their cumulative strength. As he said to me more than once, "Africa is in a hurry."

As an earnest of his neutrality, the President notes that he has not interfered with Western industrial enterprises, and says he will not do so. But these assurances are contradicted by reports that the Government plans soon to nationalize everything down to, but not including, local retail trade. This would presumably include Fria, the American-dominated consortium which has been developing Guinea's great bauxite resources. Several weeks ago, only a few months before it was to start exporting alumina, Fria discharged 3,000 workers, apparently in anticipation of nationalization.

In a defiant gesture toward France, and indeed toward the Western World, President Touré announced on March 1 that Guinea had cut itself off from the French franc zone and was issuing its own currency. Its backing, so far as is known, consists only of the bananas on the trees, the bauxite in the hills and the diamonds in the ground. Some Guineans call it *monnaie des singes*—monkey money.

Some of the President's colleagues may have intended that their rejection of France in principle would leave less and less of neutrality in practice as the country's commercial activity was more and more concentrated in the hands of the Soviet bloc and as more and more Czech and other technicians took over advisory and supervisory positions.

But probably Mr. Touré himself did not intend this, and it is doubtful whether he and most of his ministers realize as yet just how tightly they are being caught in the spider's web. "We were here before the French; the French put us in their Empire, but could not hold us. We are ourselves again, and will remain ourselves." It is a noble attitude, but hard for an inexperienced and needy little country to maintain in a modern world.

In fairness to Touré, it should be pointed out that once Guinea had opted for complete independence in September 1958, the French course of action, and the action, or rather nonaction, of the rest of the West, made the present result unavoidable. France, in effect, picked up her toys, smashed those she couldn't carry, and went home. Guinea was denuded of everything, from the uniforms off the backs of the police to the law books in the courts.

It is questionable whether Mr. Touré foresaw this. Maybe he naively thought that President de Gaulle was offering the former French colonies a real choice between independence and continued membership in the French community. Actually, it turned out to have been a dare—"Stay with us, or else." The or else proved to be shattering.

France asked her friends not to be hasty in recognizing the new Republic of Guinea. We complied. But what about the enemies? They were more astute. Recognition came instantly from the Soviet Union and all the satellite band, and by the time France brought herself to accept the situation in January 1959 and we and the British had done so, too, protocols with the Eastern bloc

had already been signed and trade was under way.

The small arms for which the new Guinea Government first turned to us to maintain order, and which we refused, were at once given by Czechoslovakia. Now police in Czech uniforms and with Skoda side arms guard the airport and the ministries.

Has the free world made no countermove to block or even hamper this piecemeal Soviet conquest? None that can be noticed. The United States sent, from its agricultural surplus stores, 3,000 tons of flour and 5,000 tons of rice. The food was sold at low prices throughout the country, was recognized as having come from America and was appreciated. Unfortunately, the first installment of our rice arrived in Conakry the same day that the full amount of a 5,000-ton gift of Communist Chinese rice was received.

The Guinea Government has made English a second compulsory language in the schools. Since it has not enough teachers for this (or for any other branch of education) it asked us for some English teachers. We have managed to supply one. She is devoted and successful, but what is one when dozens are needed?

We shall open a USIS library in Conakry as soon as the books arrive (more than a year after we recognized the new Republic). We also have offered limited technical assistance, but with strings that the Guinea Government finds unacceptable—especially since it can get any amount of Communist technical assistance for the asking and without apparent conditions.

The fact is that, although the American system of government serves us pretty well at home, it is completely helpless to deal with a whole series of situations confronting us around the world. Guinea happens to be the latest striking example.

Congress is unwilling to trust the Executive with sufficient free funds to enable it to act promptly in critical situations. It refuses to appropriate ahead so that there can be long-term planning. When Government funds are available, they are swathed in redtape, one of the purposes of which is to insure the competitive position of American private business.

But what is the competitive position of American business in a country like Guinea today? Are American private firms supposed to compete on equal terms with the Soviet Government and the satellite governments who are prepared to take any necessary loss on each individual transaction in order to gain the ultimate prize?

In the absence of private initiative, what would our Government do? It might send out a task-force to investigate the local need, and as a result might propose aid agreements in line with congressional requirements. While this was going on, the Soviet Government would have sent the goods, the construction materials and the needed technicians.

What can we do? As our Government is organized (or disorganized) today, the answer is, "Nothing." This was a surprising discovery for President Touré when he visited the United States, and it has not ceased to surprise literate Guineans since.

The fact has also been noted in the neighboring states formerly associated with Guinea in French West Africa. Since De Gaulle so severely chastised Guinea for deserting France, he has realized the necessity of finding a new road to independence for those other states with French ties. In negotiations in Paris last month, the Mali Federation (Senegal and Sudan) achieved full sovereignty while remaining within the French Community. This new relationship will be the model for the Ivory Coast, Dahomey and the other republics that formerly constituted French West Africa.

There are wise and moderate leaders in several of the new republics—Félix Houph-

ouët-Boigny in the Ivory Coast, for example, and Léopold Senghor in the Mali Federation. But though they are vigorous and sincere they belong to a political generation which will be increasingly on the defensive in the competition for African minds against nationalist leaders who have gone whole hog for political independence. If Sékou Touré succeeds in the tremendous gamble in which (perhaps to his surprise) he finds himself engaged, his example will be contagious, even though the cost has been to become increasingly dependent on the Communist bloc.

Moreover, Moscow's psychological appeal can be supported by force. Arms sent in from the Soviet bloc can be distributed, without anyone noticing, to extremists and revolutionaries throughout the region.

The colonial procedure of the European powers was to carve out separate regions: "Divide and conquer." The Soviet technique is the opposite. It aims to get control of individual leaders and the economies of individual states and to spread out from those beginnings: "Conquer and unite." We seem helpless to devise and operate any policy to meet the threat. Sometimes it seems that Washington isn't even looking.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it now in order to act on the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. LAUSCHE and Mr. AIKEN addressed the Chair.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I merely wish to make the point that the question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will yield to the Senator from Ohio, if he wishes to have me yield for a question. I am ready to yield the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. If the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is agreed to, will the substitute be subject to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments have to be agreed to before the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I will be glad to yield for a question. I am ready to yield the floor.

I yield to the Senator from Ohio for a question, if the Senator wishes to have me do so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. First, I wish the Senator from Arkansas would yield to me for a brief statement in connection with the speech of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to join with the Senator from Arkansas in his statement that the fulfillment by the Foreign Relations Committee members of their responsibility to the country is a most difficult one.

By that I mean that it is a simple matter to be in the Senate and to make recommendations of such a nature as to bring acclaim and approval from the recipients of gifts which the Government makes, or the construction of projects that bring economic enrichment to local communities. On the other hand, it is a most difficult task to fearlessly and courageously perform a duty that is related to the security of the country, when the general citizenry is not adequately acquainted with the significance of what is being done.

I have no question that the Senator from Arkansas would gladly recommend to the Senate that the entire program be discontinued and the \$4 billion saved if that course were compatible with the security of our Nation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am quite certain that every other member of the Foreign Relations Committee would gladly and proudly come before the Senate and say, "Let us abandon the program," if that were feasible and in the interest of our Nation. But we know that it cannot be done, and for that reason I commend the Senator from Arkansas for the forthrightness and directness with which he has recommended to the Senate what its course should be for the protection of our Nation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator for his commendation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Now I should like to ask the Senator a question. Will the Senator from Arkansas repeat what the advice has been of persons in the Federal Government in high echelon offices, since the end of World War II, concerning the advisability of carrying on the program of mutual security?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I said in my statement that every President and every Secretary of State without exception—and all members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—have recommended this program as being vital and indispensable to the security of this country.

I know that President Eisenhower, in his public statements—and he has said the same thing with greater vehemence privately—has said that this program is absolutely indispensable to the security of the country. He has felt that he must stress this program, because other programs in the field of domestic armament—for example, the supplying of planes for our own Air Force—have an appeal to many people. But this particular program has been subject to the misunderstanding to which the Senator has referred.

This is a bipartisan program. I know of nothing about it that could be considered remotely as being partisan. Republican Presidents and Secretaries of State, as well as Democratic Presidents and Secretaries of State, uniformly, have unanimously recommended this program as being indispensable to our security.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then it is a fact, is it not, that President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson, both Democrats; President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles, now deceased, as well as Mr. Herter, all Republicans; and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, both Republicans and Democrats, uniformly recommend the indispensability of this program for the protection of our country.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is exactly correct. There is no question whatever about it. I could go further and name Vice President Nixon, and every Secretary of Defense, both Democratic and Republican, since World War II. They have all recommended this program. In fact, they have even recommended more. As I have said in my statement, the Bureau of the Budget has cut departmental recommendations already, before this proposal came before us, by \$750 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it also fair to state that those persons having in their possession the most secret information and the most detailed knowledge of the problems confronting our country internationally, have recommended the continuance of this program?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to ask a further question with respect to the economic good which comes to the workers of our country and our manufacturers. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Arkansas to state that, with respect to the things which we send abroad, there are 500,000 Americans employed?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The best estimate we have had—and we have had such estimates on more than one occasion—is to the effect that of the vast amount of materials which are sent abroad, about 80 percent are purchased in this country, generating, it is believed, about 500,000 jobs. Practically all the purchases for military assistance, for which this year \$2 billion is asked, with the exception of a small amount, are made in this country. Such purchases include hardware, tanks, airplanes, missiles, guns, munitions, ships, and other military weapons. They are purchased here. The manufacture of those materials creates the jobs to which I have referred.

Mr. LAUSCHE. With respect to the development of military personnel, does this program help us in having available in friendly countries, such as Taiwan, Korea, Turkey, and other countries, trained men for service in case of an emergency?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is exactly correct. The Senator has described the situation very well.

There are two main categories. Not only is the program indispensable for the maintenance of our own troops in several of the countries the Senator has mentioned, together with some additional ones, but also it is even more important and more essential to the maintenance of the armies of our allies.

For example, the quite large Turkish Army could not possibly be supported by the economy of Turkey. For this

program both military assistance and defense support are absolutely necessary if we are to have a Turkish Army in being, poised and ready to repel an invasion.

The truth of the matter is that during the period since the so-called cold war began, this has been our first line of defense, the main deterrent to any incursion by the Soviet bloc.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from Arkansas express his opinion as to what the comparative strength would be, reflected by the number of troops available among our allies, and those available in the Communist bloc, if the military personnel of Taiwan, Korea, Turkey, and other countries were eliminated, and the comparison were made merely on the basis of the troops which we have in the United States and those which the Communist bloc has?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Unfortunately, I have not calculated that comparison. The figures are available. I do not have them at my fingertips at the moment, I know that in certain cases we have estimated the number of military personnel available. In Taiwan the number is about 600,000. Some 20 divisions are in Korea and another 20 in Turkey. Those are very substantial forces. They would not be in being at all without this program, and our forces would be so small as to be utterly useless.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that even with the availability of those troops among our friendly allies, the aggregate number of military men among our allies is less than the number in the Communist bloc, and if we were to eliminate the nations which I have mentioned, the comparison would be frightening?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, yes, indeed; that point is absolutely clear. It would be completely overwhelming from the standpoint of personnel advantage of the Communist bloc if we did not have the personnel of our allies. There is no doubt about it at all.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas state what the Soviet has been doing in instances where it feels that conditions are right and that there is an opportunity for it to establish itself, as it did in Guinea? What has been its general policy around the world?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In the last 2 or 3 years, there has been a clear, new trend developing of the Soviets moving into this field. One of their large programs has been in India, where they have built a million-ton steel mill, which has just been completed at a cost of \$200 million.

Most of their assistance consists of loans on favorable terms. The terms are much lower in interest than we are providing, although they are short-term loans. Many of them run for 10 or 12 years. In India there is a very large program.

In Egypt, Aswan Dam, as you know, was turned down by us. The Russians have undertaken the first stage. Only a month or so ago they pledged themselves to the second stage. That is estimated to involve over \$200 million.

Only recently, as we all know, Cuba has come into the picture. Perhaps that is the most recent example. The Russians have offered to the Cubans \$100 million in credit and to purchase, over 5 years, I believe, a million tons of sugar every year.

They have gone into Indonesia recently. One story stated that the Russians offered a credit of \$500 million. Finally it was agreed to offer \$200 million in credit.

They offered a very large credit to Yugoslavia. However, they fell out about it, and that offer was withdrawn. That indicates clearly the political motives of these loans. Afghanistan has been mentioned. At one time the Russians gave Afghanistan a \$100 million credit. I have already mentioned Guinea.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How about Ethiopia?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Russians are now in process of extending credit in Ethiopia. We have had testimony only recently of their moving in there. An Associated Press story answers the Senator's question much better, and for the RECORD, I should like to read it at this point. It reads:

SOVIET EXPORT TO RED CHINA TALLIED BY U.N.

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—A United Nations report has shown that in 4 years the Soviet Union shipped Communist China equipment for complete industrial plants valued officially at almost \$750 million.

The U.N.'s "Yearbook of International Trade Statistics—1958" listed such shipments for 1955 through 1958 at 2,933 million rubles, or \$733,375,000 at the official exchange rate of 4 rubles to the dollar.

That was well over half of Soviet exports of equipment for complete industrial plants to all countries for that 4-year period. The grand total was 4,952,600,000 rubles, or \$1,238,150,000.

The Soviets exported such equipment valued at \$175,125,000 to Poland, \$51,825,000 to Bulgaria, \$38,625,000 to Rumania, \$11,775,000 to Czechoslovakia, \$9,175,000 to Hungary, and \$1,725,000 to the Egyptian region of the United Arab Republic.

The exports to Egypt rose steeply from negligible in 1955 to \$25,000 in 1956, \$475,000 in 1957, and \$1,225,000 in 1958. To East Germany, they were \$1,150,000 in 1956, \$1,250,000 in 1957, and negligible the other 2 years.

The yearbook is rare among U.N. statistical publications in that it gives a picture of trade relations within the Communist world.

Within the sphere, it showed Communist China to be the Soviet Union's leading customer for petroleum products and the Soviet Union's chief supplier of minerals, wool, meat, vegetable oils, raw tobacco, and clothing.

It brought out that in 1958, the latest year covered, the Soviet Union had an unfavorable balance of trade with Communist China—that is, it did not sell China enough to pay for what it bought from China. The Soviet Union also had unfavorable balances with Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany—but favorable balances with Hungary, North Korea, Outer Mongolia, Poland, and Rumania.

In 1957, the Soviet Union's trade balance with the whole world was favorable. But in 1958, it turned unfavorable, partly because of bigger imports of such consumer goods as food and clothing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, is it not a fact that the Soviet has been picking its spots, and wherever it finds a break between the United States and

other nations, and it believes the field is fertile, it steps in?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am now speaking of Cuba and Guinea and Egypt and Ethiopia, and I believe there is one other nation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. India.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Afghanistan has had much aid, too. There is also Red China, which has had much aid.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is on that basis that the Committee on Foreign Relations takes the identical position that all of the leading officials in both the Republican and Democratic Parties have taken in the last 15 years about what we need to do to secure our country.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is absolutely correct. I appreciate very much his contribution.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I congratulate the Senator upon a very fine address and upon an even finer discharge of his responsibility in the highly important position which he occupies as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

I have said on a number of occasions, and I wish to say again on the floor of the Senate, that the United States and the free world are very fortunate indeed that in this crucial time the able, courageous, brilliant, practical junior Senator from Arkansas occupies this position. I am particularly pleased and honored to serve on the committee of which he is chairman. I find his performance as chairman superb.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee very much indeed for his gracious remarks.

The Senator from Tennessee has been very attentive on the committee. This is a very difficult time. Many of our members are candidates, and they are not always present. I appreciate very much indeed the assistance the Senator from Tennessee has given to the committee. He has made a fine contribution in many instances in the consideration of this very difficult subject. I certainly appreciate his assistance and his kind words.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGEE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which is identified as "4-25-60-A." I offer it on behalf of myself and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the amendment has been printed and is already on the desk of each Senator; therefore, I ask that the amendment may be printed in the RECORD at this point and that its reading may be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 19, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

"(a) Section 502, which relates to use of foreign currency, is amended as follows:

"(1) Subsection (b) is amended as follows:

"(i) Insert after the word "expended" in the proviso the words "and the amounts of dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds in connection with travel outside the United States".

"(ii) Amend the second sentence to read as follows: "Within the first sixty days that Congress is in session in each calendar year, the chairman of each such committee shall prepare a consolidated report showing the total itemized expenditures during the preceding calendar year of the committee and each subcommittee thereof, and of each member and employee of such committee or subcommittee, and shall forward such consolidated report to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives (if the committee be a committee of the House of Representatives or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Clerk of the House) or to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate (if the committee be a Senate committee or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate)."

On page 19, in lieu of lines 21 and 22, insert the following:

"(2) At the end of the section, add the following new subsection:"

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the amendment would change existing law to this extent: it would revise section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act by inserting after the word "expended" in the proviso the words "and the amounts of dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds in connection with travel outside the United States."

In the second sentence it would strike out this language: "shall consolidate the reports of each member and employee of the committee and forward said consolidated report, showing the total itemized expenditures of the committee and each subcommittee thereof during the preceding calendar year."

In place of that language it would insert the following language: "shall prepare a consolidated report showing the total itemized expenditures during the preceding calendar year of the committee and each subcommittee thereof, and of each member and employee of such committee or subcommittee, and shall forward such consolidated report."

The remainder of that paragraph would remain as presently written. It is as follows: "to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives (if the committee be a committee of the House of Representatives or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Clerk of the House) or to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate (if the committee be a Senate committee or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate). Each such report submitted by each committee shall be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within 10 legislative days after receipt by the Committee on House Administration of the House or the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate."

My amendment would merely require the submission to Congress of the amount of the expenditures for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as is presently done in the consolidated report, except that it would show an itemized breakdown of expenditures of each Member.

I have said many times that travel abroad by a congressional committee, or by individual Members of Congress, or by representatives of the executive branch can and does serve a very constructive purpose.

With our Government spending billions of dollars in foreign currencies under the various foreign assistance programs, it is important that Congress have a firsthand knowledge of how these programs are being administered, and it is only proper that those trips which are made on official business be paid for by the U.S. Government.

However, just as in the case of the expenditures of funds for any other purpose, the taxpayers, who pay these costs, are entitled to an accounting. Under the present law, this accounting is done by the chairman of the committee reporting in a lump sum the expenditures of the various subcommittees with no breakdown as to the expenditures by the individual Members nor any breakdown as to what the expenditures represent.

In the foreign travel, very often the expenses of the trip are financed partly by direct dollar expenditures and partly by counterpart funds. The counterpart funds represent foreign currencies held by the U.S. Government. In all cases, however, whether the expenditures be in the form of directly appropriated dollars or counterpart funds, they represent money belonging to the American taxpayers, and the expenditures thereof should be accurately accounted for.

I am confident that the vast majority of congressional travel has been conducted as efficiently as possible, and I again emphasize that I believe that much good has come from many of these trips.

We would, however, be unrealistic if we did not recognize that there have also been cases of abuse, and it is these cases, regardless of how isolated they may be, which give all official travel a "black eye."

Therefore, to eliminate this unjust criticism and to place greater emphasis on the responsibility to render an accounting for these expenditures, as well as to give the taxpayers their deserved protection, I am offering this amendment to S. 3058, the mutual security bill, wherein it would be provided that all expenditures by the individual members of the respective committees or staffs must be fully itemized and automatically published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This is similar to the amendment which I cosponsored a couple of years ago with the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and which was approved at that time by the Senate but was later rejected in conference.

Congress very properly demands that the executive branch shall render an

accurate public accounting of their appropriated funds, and when such accounting has not been readily available the Department at fault has been very severely criticized.

There has been incorporated in the comparable bill approved by the House of Representatives—that is, the mutual security bill passed last week by the House—a special provision requiring that the executive branch make available to the Comptroller General's auditors all records relating to the operations or expenditures under the Mutual Security Act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did the Senator say just now that Congress requires the executive branch to render a similar accounting of its travel expenses?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In the bill passed by the House and which will be in conference, it requires the executive branch to make available its records for auditing by the Comptroller General.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is that accounting already required by law?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That the executive branch render an accounting? Yes, but there has been some dispute between the General Accounting Office and the executive branch.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the President render an itemized accounting? Has any mention been made of the cost of his recent trip to South America?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The cost of the President's trips is not published, as the Senator knows, but I am sure the records are available if you request them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understood the Senator from Delaware to say that it is.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I said that the bill passed by the House contains an item which provides that the expenditures made by the executive branch under this program shall be subject to audit by the Comptroller General. That provision is in the bill passed by the House.

As I understand it, it is the law now that the expenses of the President are subject to audit by the Comptroller General. The expenditures of Members of Congress for foreign travel, however, are not subject to audit by the Comptroller General nor are they published. That is what I am trying to correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They are not published?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Expenditures of the executive branch are available if the Senator wants to get them and make them public.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator certain about that?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have never heard of anyone who wished to get them being turned down.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Has the Senator ever requested them?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. Has the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Has the Senator ever heard of anybody who requested them?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The fact that no one has requested them does not mean that they would be denied to anyone who might wish to examine the reports or make them public. If the Senator from Arkansas desires to ascertain what the costs on any particular occasion are he should properly direct his request to the executive branch.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator said, I believe, that the members of the executive branch do just what he seeks to do by his amendment. I do not believe that is quite true.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I said that members of the executive branch should be held accountable for all their expenditures. It is quite possible that at a later date I shall be discussing expenditures which have been made in the executive branch and which, in my opinion, have not been properly accounted for. That, however, has nothing to do with this proposal.

There already is a law which provides that the expenditures of the executive branch shall be accounted for and that the Comptroller General shall have the right to audit the accounts. It is true, there has been some dispute between the executive branch and the Comptroller General concerning this authority, but that dispute even is settled by language included in the bill passed by the House last week.

There is incorporated in the House bill a provision that the Comptroller General shall always have the right to audit these expenditures. I think that should be done. Those funds are public funds. Why should they not be audited? By the same token why should we not render an accounting of our expenditures for foreign travel?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not saying they should not be. I simply want to get the record straight. Are the travel accounts of the Vice President published in the same way in which the Senator is asking that travel accounts of Senators be published?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They are not as far as this section applies.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Because section 502(b) —

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has said that the executive branch is subject to the same regulation as the legislative branch.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the record of expenditures of any trip is desired, it is my understanding that it can be obtained. As the Senator has admitted there is no one who has asked for that information and has been refused.

Section 502 of the Mutual Security Act specifically provides that expenditures of counterpart funds by Members of Congress need not be publicly accounted for, nor are they audited by the Comptroller General. This is the only instance I know of in which public funds can be spent by either Congress or the executive branch in which such a cloak of secrecy exists. I am trying to remove that cloak of secrecy.

If the Senator from Arkansas wants to amend another law correcting any other similar abuse that he might know of I shall support him.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is true that under existing law the information must be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The only difference is that each individual amount is not published, just as the amounts spent by the President and the Vice President are not published. I think the Senator from Delaware, to be consistent, ought to require them to publish the individual accounts. The Senator is a great exponent of this principle. I would not undertake to rewrite his amendment. I am only raising the question of its consideration.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Section 502(b) in no way refers to the executive branch.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It does not refer to dollar expenditures, either.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No, but my amendment does.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This question should be raised, in my opinion, in connection with the legislative appropriation bill or some other bill. I have no objection to the principle of the amendment. I am personally willing to abide by it. I do not believe this bill is the proper vehicle to use for such an amendment. That is what I told the Senator in committee. The Mutual Security Act is not a proper instrument to reform practices of Senate committees. Why does he not put his amendment on an appropriation bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The bill deals with section 502, and this is the most appropriate place.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It goes beyond section 502.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The amendment could not be offered to an appropriation bill, as the Senator from Arkansas well knows.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Because it is legislation and would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Has there ever been an appropriation bill to come before the Senate which was not full of legislation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It takes a two-thirds vote to suspend the rules in order to get adopted on an appropriation bill an amendment containing legislation.

This procedure requires only a majority vote. I am offering the amendment where I believe I shall have the easiest opportunity to have it adopted.

In my opinion the very least we in Congress can do is to demonstrate to the executive branch by adopting the amendment, that we are willing to live by our own code. We are demanding—and as one Member of Congress, I shall continue to demand—that the executive branch make an accounting of that which they have spent. At a latter date, I shall discuss some of those expenditures.

This amendment, however, deals with the expenditure of money by Members of Congress. Let us settle that question first. As far as I know this is the only

instance in which Congress has said money can be spent but no public accounting will be made. I think it is time we remove the cloak of secrecy from such expenditures.

The American taxpayers are entitled to an accounting of any spending of public funds. We must not overlook the fact that these foreign currencies, owned by our Government, really belong to the American taxpayers.

Once again I emphasize that in my opinion much good has come from some of the congressional travel abroad and that for these official trips the Government should pay the legitimate expenses of the traveling Members of Congress. The adoption of this amendment would merely require a public accounting of our official expenditures when we travel abroad.

The argument has been made that to keep a record of their expenditures would entail too much work for Members of Congress.

Existing law requires that the average taxpayer itemize on his tax return all expenses for which he claims tax deductions as business expenses. The same requirement applies to corporations. If it is not too burdensome for the taxpayers to keep records, it should not be too much trouble for Members of Congress. The very least the Members of Congress can do when they spend money which belongs to the taxpayers is to make a similar accounting.

Mr. President, I shall request a yeas-and-nays vote on the question of agreeing to this amendment, but I do not believe that the number of Senators present at this time is sufficient to make possible the entering of an order for the yeas and nays. Therefore, I will be requesting a quorum call.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGEE in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the RECORD should be kept straight; so in that connection I ask unanimous consent to have section 502 of the existing Mutual Security Act printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the section was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 502. USE OF FOREIGN CURRENCY.—(a) Notwithstanding section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, or any other provision of law, proceeds of sales made under section 550 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, shall remain available and shall be used for any purposes of this Act, giving particular regard to the following purposes—

(1) for providing military assistance to nations or mutual defense organizations eligible to receive assistance under this Act;

(2) for purchase of goods or services in friendly nations;

(3) for loans, under applicable provisions of this Act, to increase production of goods or services, including strategic materials, needed in any nation with which an agreement was negotiated, or in other friendly nations, with the authority to use currencies received in repayment for the purposes stated in this section or for deposit to the

general account of the Treasury of the United States;

(4) for developing new markets on a mutually beneficial basis;

(5) for grants-in-aid to increase production for domestic needs in friendly countries; and

(6) for purchasing materials for United States stockpiles.

(b) Notwithstanding section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to appropriate committees of the Congress engaged in carrying out their duties under section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Joint Economic Committee and the Select Committees on Small Business of the Senate and House of Representatives for their local currency expenses: *Provided*, That each member or employee of any such committee shall make, to the chairman of such committee in accordance with regulations prescribed by such committee, an itemized report showing the amounts and dollar equivalent values of each such foreign currency expended, together with the purposes of the expenditure, including lodging, meals, transportation, and other purposes. Within the first sixty days that Congress is in session in each calendar year, the chairman of each such committee shall consolidate the reports of each member and employee of the committee and forward said consolidated report showing the total itemized expenditures of the committee and each subcommittee thereof during the preceding calendar year, to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives (if the committee be a committee of the House of Representatives or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Clerk of the House) or to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate (if the committee be a Senate committee or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate). Each such report submitted by each committee shall be published in the Congressional Record within ten legislative days after receipt by the Committee on House Administration of the House or the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(c) Notwithstanding section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, or any other provision of law, if the President finds that participation by the United States in an internationally financed program to preserve the great cultural monuments of the Upper Nile would promote the foreign policy of the United States he may, subject to the approval of the Congress, use or enter into agreements with friendly nations or organizations of nations to use, for this purpose, foreign currencies owned by the United States which have been generated under this Act or under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, in the countries in which the program is to be carried out, but the value of foreign currencies so used shall not exceed an amount equal to 33 1/3 per centum of the total cost of such program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to make clear that the remarks of the Senator from Delaware may, erroneously, be interpreted by some as dealing with a matter of great secrecy. However, section 502 was included in the law last year, on the recommendation of the committee; and it requires that an itemized accounting be made of the total expenditures for all purposes.

I now read from subsection (b) of section 502:

Within the first sixty days that Congress is in session in each calendar year, the chair-

man of each such committee shall consolidate the reports of each member and employee of the committee and forward said consolidated report, showing the total itemized expenditures of the committee and each subcommittee thereof during the preceding calendar year, to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives (if the committee be a committee of the House of Representatives or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Clerk of the House) or to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate (if the committee be a Senate committee or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate).

That part of the law requires such reporting, and there is that reporting.

The remarks of the Senator from Delaware would seem to imply that some different procedure is followed in this case. But, as I have already pointed out, the procedure here is no different from the procedure followed by the executive branch. The President does not publish such information. He merely reports it to the Comptroller General. Similarly, we report the information to the committee.

Furthermore, many of the members of my committee who have made foreign trips have voluntarily published, in their reports to the Senate, an itemized account of their expenditures.

The Senator from Delaware has referred to expenditures by businessmen and to the income tax returns of businessmen. In their income-tax returns, they itemize those expenditures—just as Senators itemize these expenditures in their reports to the committee. But income tax returns are not published. So I think it unfair to suggest that there is any great amount of secrecy in this connection. The Senator from Delaware knows that the income-tax returns of businessmen are not published. The Finance Committee may examine the returns, under certain circumstances; but they are not made public.

All these accounts are furnished to the chairman of the committee, and are consolidated; and the totals are published in the RECORD. I do not see anything wrong with the existing practice. No one is trying to fool anyone.

Similarly, when the Vice President makes a trip abroad, he is not required to publish an itemized account of his expenditures. He reports them, just as we do.

I have no objection to the amendment, except that it should not be applied so narrowly. If such an amendment is to be adopted, it should apply all the way across the board, and should also apply to the President and to the Vice President.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The only difference from existing law is that the itemized list furnished by the individual Members will, in turn, be submitted to the Congress rather than consolidated in one, overall return. That is the difference.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have not said that the income tax returns of businessmen are published. I said the American businessmen have to keep and file the same records that this amendment would require of Members of Con-

gress when they are spending public money. If this record keeping is not too burdensome for the taxpayers it will not hurt us.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But all income tax returns are kept secret, in that they are not published. Is that not true?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; but the Government can examine the returns and can find fault with them if it wishes to do so.

On the other hand, when Members of Congress make foreign trips and, in that connection, spend money which belongs to the American taxpayers, why should such expenditures be kept under a cloak of secrecy? Why should we not render a public accounting?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then why does not the Senator from Delaware provide in the amendment that all income tax returns be published?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Let us not be ridiculous, Mr. President. If the Senator from Arkansas is opposed to the amendment let him vote against it. He knows that this amendment does not even mention tax returns.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But I think the Senator from Delaware is leaving an implication that is not warranted by the existing facts; and I believe the RECORD should be accurate and clear.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. So far as I know, no other branch of the Government is treated in the way that the Members of Congress voted to treat themselves when by means of a provision which was included in a former Mutual Security Act, it was provided that we could spend these foreign currencies and not have to render any public accounting.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But in my opinion that is not so; I think that is an incorrect interpretation of what the law now provides.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Senator from Arkansas believes that the law now provides for full disclosure, why should the Senator object to the adoption of this amendment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not objecting to it; I merely say there should be complete disclosure all across the board, if that is to be the procedure called for by the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Is there any different treatment if a congressional committee makes a foreign trip and, in that connection, uses funds which it obtains from the chairman of the committee? In the other case, the committee uses counterpart funds.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Under this amendment there is no difference in the expenditures of dollars or foreign currencies.

Mr. BUTLER. Is there any difference now?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No.

Mr. BUTLER. Then why does not every Member of Congress submit a statement of his dollar expenditures the minute he returns to the United States? But we have never done that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Several Members have submitted itemized

reports to the Congress. This amendment will require them all to do so.

Mr. BUTLER. But does any rule require that that be done?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. Not under present law.

Mr. BUTLER. In other words, if a Member of Congress spends American dollars in paying his expenses on such a trip, when he returns to this country he informs his committee chairman of what he has spent; and the committee chairman sends that itemized account to the General Accounting Office, and it is there a public record. The same is true if counterpart funds are used. So I do not see the difference.

If there is to be a requirement that an itemized statement of the expenditures be made public, by stating it on the floor of the Senate, why not make a similar requirement in the case of American dollars that are spent by Senators in paying the expenditures required in connection with such trips?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Under existing law both are treated alike, and the same is true under this amendment. Neither are made public under existing law.

Mr. BUTLER. But no one has ever said there was any secrecy in connection with the dollar expenditures made by a Senator who took such a trip. However, there seems to be a suggestion of some sort of mystery about the use of counterpart funds for such purposes.

I agree with the Senator from Arkansas; I think the public are entitled to have this information. But when a Senator, upon his return, submits a detailed account to the committee chairman, and when that account is available to every member of the committee, I think that constitutes sufficient accounting.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is in accordance with existing law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Existing law requires that that information be available to the committee chairman and presumably, to the other members of the committee, but to no one else. But existing law does not require that an audit of those expenditures be made by the Comptroller General. Nor are they available for public examination.

This amendment would require the publishing of these records. In other words it would require an accounting.

Even in an instance where the State Department might see a glaring abuse in the spending of these funds by a Member of Congress or a staff member it could not question it.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIER. I wish to commend the Senator from Delaware for submitting the amendment. I believe it is an excellent one. Certainly it is time for the American people to have these facts.

Under the circumstances, I think the Members of Congress perhaps should be encouraged to travel abroad even more. But, at the same time, the American people have a perfect right to know where their tax funds are going.

I think the Senator from Delaware is performing a very valuable service by offering the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to associate myself with the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. I assume that the expenditures for the trips which have been made have been justified. If they have been justified, there should be no question about a willingness to submit open reports for examination by the public.

I find a difference between asking private enterprise, through its directors and officials, to submit reports—their is not public business—and asking a Senator or Representative who goes abroad as the agent of the American people to submit a report. The people are his principal, and the principal is entitled to have an accounting from his agent. It is, in effect, a position of trust, and that position requires an open disclosure of what expenditures have been made and how they have been justified while the agent is acting in behalf of his principal.

I think that we shall be serving ourselves and the people of the United States in letting them know that Senators have no qualms or fears about disclosing fully, in open daylight, what their activities have been and what their expenditures were when they made trips to foreign countries.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree with the Senator from Ohio, and I thank him for his contribution. I point out again that four or five members of the Foreign Relations Committee, and perhaps other Members of the Senate whose activities have escaped my attention, have made an accounting similar to that which is proposed. All the comment I have seen in the press editorially was complimentary with respect to those trips and the accounting.

I think much good has been rendered by many of these trips. I support them. I think official trips should be financed by the U. S. Government.

As the Senator from Ohio has pointed out, when those trips are on official business the people are willing to pay for them, but they are entitled to an accounting. That is all we are asking in this amendment. This is public money we are spending. We are in an unjustifiable position when we criticize the executive branch of the Government for imposing a cloak of secrecy on their expenditures when we impose one on ourselves.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I am trying to ascertain if we can arrive at some kind of agreement. A few moments ago the Senator was about to suggest the absence of a quorum. I do not know whether we shall be able to secure a quorum.

The minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], has just come into the Chamber. I asked him to come.

I wondered if we could go over until tomorrow morning at 12, with the understanding that at a certain hour the Senate would vote on the amendment. I wonder if such an arrangement is agreeable.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, it is agreeable to me, if the Senator wants to make such a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Whether we vote tonight or go over until tomorrow does not make any difference to me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I cannot speak for the majority leader, but I do not suppose he has any objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to direct attention to the fact that, among other things, we have a joint meeting scheduled for tomorrow. I made a suggestion that the Senate meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, so action on the bill could be completed early in the day. If the Senator will bear with me for a moment, I think it is only appropriate to acquaint the majority leader with the situation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Perhaps we could get enough Senators in the Chamber to have the yeas and nays ordered.

Mr. President, if it is satisfactory, in order to avoid suggesting the absence of a quorum, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be ordered on this amendment.

Mr. WILEY. My only thought was whether a quorum could be obtained. The suggestion of the absence of a quorum would result in pulling Senators from here and yonder.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, is the request that the yeas and nays be considered as having been ordered?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I will leave it to the leadership whether we should have a vote tonight or carry it over until tomorrow.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me for a moment, while he is inquiring, I wish to make clear my position. I think the existing law, insofar as the responsibilities of the Foreign Relations Committee are concerned, deals with foreign currencies. The Senator is quite correct; I have no objection to the Senator's effort to make this information public. I certainly have no personal interest in it, because I do not particularly like to travel. This provision may give me an excuse not to travel any further, because I prefer to stay at home.

The Senator is injecting the requirement in regard to dollars. This proposal does go beyond the present specifics that relate to the Foreign Relations Committee. It involves the Appropriations Committees and all the other committees which traditionally have used dollars. I do not object to the reports being made

public. I only object to the Senator from Delaware using the instance he referred to as an example of itemized reporting, because it is not an appropriate example, since the reports are not published.

My only comment with regard to the President and Vice President is that those reports are not published, and the Senator is not proposing that they be published. I do not object to the President's spending what is necessary on these trips. It is perfectly proper. But I can see how it might not be very good public relations to have this information published, because, in the eyes of farmers and other persons who are having a hard time making a living, to read that \$5 or \$10 million were spent on a trip to South America might not be appreciated by them.

The discussions that were had did not primarily relate to the requirement of reporting. There is a requirement of reporting in the present law. If it is desired to provide that the Comptroller General be included in the examination, I am sure there is no objection. The real objection is the fact that persons who do not understand the requirements of going to a foreign country, and requiring the Committee on Foreign Relations to examine into and investigate foreign operations, especially in the military field, would never comprehend the need for it if that information were published on an individual basis.

Whether the amendment is adopted or not does not make any difference to me. I am perfectly willing to vote for the proposal but I was not willing to accept it in the committee because I thought it was the responsibility of the whole Senate to consider it, and the Members of this body ought to know what they were doing. This proposal will require that the itemized individual expenditures of every Member be published in the RECORD. I think this information will be used adversely in many instances, when individual Members should not be prejudiced in that way, because most of the trips are taken at the request of the Senate or interparliamentary groups or other authorities which are perfectly legitimate.

The press is likely to refer to any trip as a junket. They refer to every trip, no matter what the necessities are, as a junket, and that is the background against which this kind of publication will be announced.

Nevertheless, I am willing to vote for the amendment. I shall vote for it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I am not suggesting this amendment with the thought of holding any Member of Congress up to ridicule. I have said before, and I repeat, that I think it will serve a constructive purpose. I know of no better way to emphasize that the Senator from Arkansas is unduly alarmed than by pointing out that five, and perhaps six, members of the Foreign Relations Committee have already done what this amendment proposes be done by every Member of the Congress; namely, publish their expenditures of public funds; and not one of them has been criticized in the press so far as I have seen.

On the contrary, I have seen many comments in the press complimenting these Members of the Senate. I do not think the press is going to blow up out of proportion the fact that some Senator has taken an official trip where the trip is paid for by the Government and a proper accounting rendered. On the other hand, if in the accounting something turns up which cannot be justified to the taxpayers we may be criticized, and perhaps—only perhaps—there are some expenditures which deserve criticism.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend as Chairman of the Economic Committee a meeting of the NATO Parliamentary Conference at Strasbourg, France.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are absent on official business as members of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BRUNSDALE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL], would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—68

Aiken	Fong	Martin
Allott	Fulbright	Monroney
Bartlett	Goldwater	Morton
Bible	Gore	Mundt
Bush	Hart	Muskie
Butler	Hartke	Pastore
Byrd, Va.	Hennings	Prouty
Cannon	Hill	Proxmire
Capehart	Holland	Randolph
Case, N.J.	Jackson	Robertson
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Church	Johnston, S.C.	Scott
Clark	Jordan	Smathers
Cooper	Keating	Smith
Curtis	Kerr	Stennis
Dirksen	Kuchel	Talmadge
Dodd	Lausche	Thurmond
Douglas	Lusk	Wiley
Dworshak	McCarthy	Williams, Del.
Eastland	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.
Engle	Magnuson	Young, Ohio
Ervin	Mansfield	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—32

Anderson	Green	McClellan
Beall	Gruening	Morse
Bennett	Hayden	Moss
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Murray
Brunsdale	Hruska	O'Mahoney
Byrd, W. Va.	Humphrey	Russell
Carlson	Javits	Schoepfel
Carroll	Kefauver	Sparkman
Chavez	Kennedy	Symington
Cotton	Long, Hawaii	Yarborough
Frear	Long, La.	

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment, to incorporate language in the bill, which appeared in the bill last year as it was reported to the Senate. It was adopted by the Senate, but it was not agreed to in conference. It is the so-called foreign language amendment, which would make it possible for teachers of foreign languages to receive scholarships which would be supported by counterpart funds.

I have shown the amendment to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. It was his amendment last year. I thought it had merit last year, and I should like to see it included in the bill this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, it is a little lengthy to read. On my statement that it is a verbatim copy of the language which was included in the Senate bill last year, I suggest that it be not read and be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 26 after line 8, insert the following:

"Sec. 607. Public Law 885, Eighty-fourth Congress (70 Stat. 890, 5 U.S.C. 170f-170t), which provides certain basic authority for the Department of State is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section reading as follows:

"Sec. 16. (a) The Secretary of State is authorized to make grants to individuals who are engaged in teaching any modern foreign language, in an elementary or secondary school or an institution of higher education. Such grants shall be for the purpose of enabling such individuals, during the summer period when their services as teachers are not required, to obtain in an area, region, or country in which the language they are teaching is commonly used, advanced training in such language and training in other fields needed for a full understanding of such area, region, or country. The Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to the selection of individuals for grants under this section and the establishment of standards for their selection, and the Secretary of State may make arrangements for the performance by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of such functions under this section as may be mutually agreeable to the Secretary of State and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(b) Notwithstanding section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, or any other provision of law, the Secretary of State, in carrying out the provisions of this section may use currencies, or credits for currencies of any foreign government (1) held or available for expenditure by the United States and not required by law or agreement with such government to be expended or used for any other purpose, or (2) made available under the provisions of subsection (c) of this section.

"(c) In order to make additional funds available for the purposes of this section the Secretary of State is authorized to enter into an executive agreement or agreements with any foreign government for the use of currencies, or credits for currencies, of such government deposited pursuant to agreements entered into under section 142(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 or section 115(b)(6) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, or any other Act and not required by agreement with such government to be expended or used for any other purposes."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have told the Senator from South Dakota that I am strongly in favor of the amendment and am willing to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL
10 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I remind the Senate that we shall have a joint session tomorrow. I hope we can have a relatively short morning hour and that we can then proceed to the consideration of any amendments that may be offered to the pending bill, with the hope that we can reach a vote on the passage of the bill sometime tomorrow. I should like to have all Members to be prepared for a yea-and-nay vote tomorrow.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1960

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3058) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BRUNSDALE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], I desire to submit an amendment, which I ask to have printed and to lie on the table, and printed in the RECORD.

I should like to explain the effect of the amendment. It would include a statement of policy to reaffirm American support for freedom of navigation in international waterways, including the Suez Canal, opposition to economic warfare, including boycotts, blockades, and restrictions of the use of international waterways.

Its purpose is to express the will of Congress, but to be applied as the President may determine to be proper.

I may say that this statement of policy was recommended by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, was adopted by the House, and appears in the House bill. Unfortunately, it is not included in the bill being considered by the Senate.

The sponsors of the measure believe that the House committee makes it clear that this statement refers to the blockade of the Suez Canal. The amendment leaves the prime authority for the application of the policy in the hands of the President, but it lays down a clear statement of an important international principle which will reinforce the ad-

ministration in its efforts to secure freedom of navigation through this all-important waterway, and to promote the cause of peace in the Middle East.

Mr. President, I believe I have already asked that the amendment be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Additional sponsors will have an opportunity to join in sponsoring the amendment during the session tomorrow. I ask that the amendment may be received and printed and lie on the table, and that the text of the amendment may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 11, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

"STATEMENT OF POLICY

"Sec. 2. Section 2 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which is a statement of policy, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(f) It is the sense of the Congress that inasmuch as—

"(1) the United States favors freedom of navigation in international waterways and economic cooperation between nations; and

"(2) the purposes of this Act are negated and the peace of the world is endangered when nations which receive assistance under this Act wage economic warfare against other nations assisted under this Act, including such procedures as boycotts, blockades, and the restriction of the use of international waterways;

assistance under this Act and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, shall be administered to give effect to these principles, and, in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state arising as a result of funds appropriated under this Act or arising under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, these principles shall be applied, as the President may determine, and he shall report on measures taken by the administration to insure their application."

THE ITEM VETO ON APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on February 3, 1959, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] introduced Senate Joint Resolution 44, which proposes a constitutional amendment to give the President of the United States the power to disapprove specific and individual items in general appropriation bills.

The need for an item veto, which this amendment would provide, has long been recognized by many of us in the Congress as a necessary and important step forward in the constant battle to reduce or eliminate unneeded expenditures of public funds.

I was pleased to join with several other Senators in cosponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 44 with the Senator from New York. The junior Senator from New York has long been an advocate of the item veto, and sponsored similar legislation on several occasions when he served in the House of Representatives.

The Senator has recently written an excellent article citing both the great need and the advantages to be derived from the adoption of an item veto provision in our Constitution. The article first appeared in the Harvard Law Record of February 11, 1960, and was later reprinted in the Federal Bar News of April 1960. I commend it to all Senators as a fine statement of the need for this legislation, and request unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ITEM VETO: A NEEDED REFORM

(By Senator KENNETH B. KEATING)

(The Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING received his LL.B. from the Harvard Law School in 1923. Since that time he has been in the practice of law in Rochester, N.Y. During World War II, he rose from major to brigadier general in the Army, serving in both the European and Asian theaters. He was a Member of the House of Representatives for the 80th through the 85th Congresses. In 1958 he was elected to the U.S. Senate as a Republican from New York. He presently serves in that capacity.)

For nearly a century the pros and cons of granting the President of the United States the authority to veto specific items in appropriation bills approved by Congress have been considered. While there have been sporadic bursts of interest in this subject, there has never been the consistent and sustained backing for this proposal that its potential importance justifies.

I am hopeful the present national concern about our fiscal stability, combined with the successful experience of our States in utilizing this valuable tool, will soon lead to affirmative action by Congress and the American people on the item veto. In my opinion, no step is longer overdue, no reform could reap greater benefits for individual taxpayers, and no single change in our governmental processes could save more money more wisely.

Article 1, section 7, of the Constitution provides that "every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approves he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it."

This veto power of the President, as it was written into the Constitution and as he must exercise it today, places a serious and unnecessary handicap on the Chief Executive. It is an "all or nothing at all" decision that confronts him each time a bill appears on his desk.

With regard to appropriation measures, this situation is especially unfortunate, and it is only in connection with money bills that the item veto has been seriously considered. It is not at all unusual for an appropriation bill to contain many separate items listing the goods or services or functions of the Government along with their costs. Yet the President, in spite of his experience and knowledge of the agencies which will receive and spend this money, and his overall budgetary responsibilities, is given no opportunity to exercise discretion on a selective basis.

At a time when the budget of the United States, even after it has been carefully prepared with the utmost savings in mind, is bound to be enormous, this situation is difficult to understand or justify. The President must accept the wasteful and extravagant items along with the useful and necessary ones, or he gets nothing by vetoing the entire bill.

The item veto, therefore, is not just some abstruse or trifling governmental device of

interest only to political scientists and constitutional lawyers. It should be the concern of every American citizen, who has a right to expect of his Government nothing less than the most efficient use of every dollar he contributes in taxes.

Adoption of the item veto by the Federal Government would not mean the introduction of some new and untried process into the Federal Government processes. On the contrary, the longtime use of this power in the American States constitutes one of the most persuasive arguments for its application at the national level.

The item veto first appeared in America during the Civil War in the Constitution of the Confederate States. Its record of adoption by the States following this conflict is most impressive. As new States entered the Union, and as older ones revised their constitutions, the item veto for the Governor became an established feature. With the admission of our newest States, Alaska and Hawaii, both of which provide for the item veto, the number of States with this provision now totals 42.

TRIBUTE

No State which has granted its Governor this power has ever subsequently withdrawn it. This is an impressive tribute to its practical value and a striking refutation to the arguments of those who fear its abuse.

The use of the item veto and the strong endorsement it has been given by many Governors constitute the most eloquent testimony to its real worth. Data presented at hearings before the House Judiciary Committee in 1957 on the item veto fully support this statement. For example, in Pennsylvania, where records have been kept with some care, appropriations were reduced by almost \$166 million through item vetoes between 1931 and 1957. Another \$133 million was cut out through vetoes of entire bills. The fact that the larger amount was removed through the selective type of veto is an interesting commentary on its usefulness.

These figures do not, of course, prove that the Governor was always right and the legislature always wrong. What they do show is the effect of having a second look, a second type of expertness, backed up with the power to act, at work in the appropriations process. They show the positive effects of vigorous application of this power.

As might be expected, the item veto has drawn much enthusiastic support from the Governors themselves. Former Governor Driscoll, of New Jersey, wrote: "Although the . . . item veto . . . will be sparingly used, the Governor attaches great significance to it." Former Governor of Illinois, Frank Lowden, said: "It has been helpful in keeping expenditures down." Former Governor Burnquist, of Minnesota, called the item veto "a very wise provision." The former Governors of Iowa, Indiana, Nevada, and North Carolina, States not conferring the right to veto items, expressed regret that this power was denied them. In the course of congressional hearings in 1954, every single Governor who responded answered "Yes" to the question: "In your opinion, has the item veto been a desirable feature of your State government?"

In a statement prepared for the 1957 hearings, Prof. Frank W. Prescott, who has written extensively on the item veto, concluded: "Upon the basis of State experience and in some of the larger cities which have the item veto, the writer would endorse the item veto in principle for the President of the United States."

Many other distinguished political scientists share these views. One of the greatest of them, Lord Bryce, in his classic study, "The American Commonwealth," wrote: "Such an amendment [the item veto] is desired by enlightened men. . . . Small as the change seems, its adoption would . . .

save the Nation millions of dollars a year, by diminishing wasteful expenditure on local purposes."

More recently, Sydney Hyman has written in his volume, "The American President," that the item veto "would enable the President to pinpoint the pernicious details of legislation and appropriations, and veto them while he signed what remained. At present he has to throw the baby out with the bath water, or drink the bath water in order to embrace the baby."

PRESIDENT COMPELLED

In his recent book, "The American Presidency," Prof. Clinton Rossiter wrote:

"There is one final defect in the relations of President and Congress of which we should take careful note. . . . I refer to his lack of any power to veto separate items in the overstuffed appropriations bills presented for his approval. The President often feels compelled to sign bills that are full of dubious grants and subsidies rather than risk a breakdown in the work of whole departments."

Opponents of the item veto at the Federal level have expressed their fear that it would give the President too much power—power gained at the expense of Congress. As a general principle, I am in sympathy with the belief that we must zealously guard legislative responsibilities and prerogatives.

In the case of the item veto, however, I do not believe this to be a compelling argument. In the first place, both the beginning and the final responsibility for appropriations would continue to remain right where the Constitution placed them—with Congress. The custom would continue of initiating spending bills in the House Appropriations Committee; and the power of Congress to override an item veto, as well as the veto of an entire bill, would, of course, be complete and final.

It has also been contended that the item veto would weaken congressional responsibility for appropriations. This position can hardly be maintained. It is true that the President's role in the appropriations process would be enlarged, but this would be desirable since practically all Federal money is spent by the executive agencies which are responsible to him and for which he is responsible. But, as I have already indicated, ultimate authority at both the start and the finish with regard to these appropriations would still be with Congress. Any loss of responsibility by Congress in this matter would, therefore, be the result of a forfeiture by Congress itself rather than a forced deprivation.

The idea of the item veto has been attacked on the grounds that it would upset the system of checks and balances and weakens the doctrine of the separation of powers. There is little reason in theory to worry about this, and the extensive experience in the States with the item veto helps refute this charge. The fundamental authority and responsibility of both the President and Congress would remain unchanged. The President surely would find his hand strengthened with respect to appropriations, but not more than is necessary to execute properly the duties placed upon him by the Constitution.

The advantages of the item veto are obvious and compelling. It would reduce public expenditures substantially by making possible the reduction or elimination of many unnecessary "pork barrel" appropriations. The item veto could snip out the verbiage without rejecting the rest of the bill.

RIDERS ELIMINATED

In short, the item veto should go a long way toward establishing a fair and rational method for determining appropriations, and it could serve to expedite the entire process as well. All of this says nothing of the great potential value of the item veto as a means

of doing away with riders, those pieces of substantive legislation having nothing whatsoever to do with appropriations, but attached, nevertheless, to appropriations bills because only in this way can they be passed. Most riders are usually too weak to stand alone, but under the present arrangement the President must either approve them or wipe out the whole appropriation.

Many of our Presidents have deplored their lack of authority to veto separate items. Buchanan did so in his first annual message to Congress. Grant asked for a constitutional amendment to effect the change. Hayes chafed under the weight of undesirable riders he had to take with the appropriations. Arthur and Taft both urged the adoption of the item veto, as did Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In the second volume of his "Memoirs," former President Truman wrote: "One important lack in the presidential veto power . . . is the authority to veto individual items in appropriation bills." In one letter to the Speaker of the House, President Eisenhower urged that Congress ". . . help assure continuing economy . . . take action that will grant the President the power now held by many State Governors to veto specific items in appropriation bills." He has repeatedly voiced his backing for this proposal in messages to Congress.

If the item veto is to be given to the President, how should it be done? This action could take any of two forms which are now before Congress. They are the Executive order method and the amending of the Constitution.

The Executive order plan would grant to the President by statutory law what is, in effect, the item veto. The phrasing of the bill before the present Congress (S. 2373), of which I am cosponsor, very well explains its purpose: "That the President is authorized to eliminate or reduce by Executive order, in whole or in part, any appropriation or appropriations made by an act or joint resolution. . . ." Under this measure the public interest becomes the primary criterion by which the President would be guided. His decision would stand unless either House of Congress passed a resolution within 60 days stating that it does not favor this action.

This method is similar to that which controls Presidential reorganizations of the executive branch agencies. As applied to appropriation vetoes, it has a precedent in an amendment offered to a money bill by Representative Woodrum in 1938. At that time a careful legal memorandum was written justifying the constitutionality of this approach.

If given no other choice, I should be happy to support the Executive order method because I am convinced that any form of the item veto would be of great value. My preference, however, is for an amendment to the Constitution to achieve this objective. Senate Joint Resolution 44, which I introduced in February 1959, and which is similar to measures I sponsored for years as a member of the House of Representatives, calls for the adoption of such an amendment. The proposal is straightforward and clear. Although the issue is of great importance, it can be expressed in unmistakable language, and that is what I have tried to do.

AMENDMENT

The heart of my amendment reads simply:

"The President shall have the power to disapprove any item or items of any general appropriation bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate and have been presented to him for his approval, in the same manner and subject to the same limitations as he may, under section 7 of article I of this Constitution, disapprove as a whole any bill which shall have been presented to him."

Granting the item veto by constitutional amendment rather than by some other method would, in my judgment, have distinct advantages. Perhaps the most important of these is that there would be absolutely no question about its legality. Despite strong legal arguments that can be mustered in support of other methods, such as by amending the statutes, a shadow of doubt would still lie over them in the minds of some people. There would always be the possibility of their being challenged as being in conflict with the veto provisions of the Constitution. I find myself in agreement with the words of Prof. Edward Corwin, who wrote in his "The President: Office and Powers": "I find persuasive * * * the argument that this reform (item veto) would require a constitutional amendment."

ARGUMENT

Another argument in favor of the amendment method is that, once adopted, it could be revoked only by going through the amendment process again. This would protect the President from any hasty, capricious, or ill-considered action by Congress that might arise as a result of a conflict or misunderstanding.

It can be argued, of course, that an amendment would make it far more difficult to correct a mistake. This is true. But the evidence, including the experiences of the States, is overwhelming that the item veto, far from being a mistake, would be a most valuable addition to the procedures and techniques of good government.

I believe firmly that the Constitution should not be amended except for the most pressing and compelling reasons. It should not be amended if a desirable objective of fundamental importance can be attained by other legal means. Amending the Constitution is a very serious business which should be undertaken only after the most profound thought and after every alternative approach to a problem has of necessity been rejected for good and substantial reasons.

OPINION

In my opinion, on the basis of these standards, giving the President the power to veto separate items in appropriation bills is of sufficient importance to justify this change in our fundamental law. Achieving this goal will not be easy, but no goal of any value was ever attained without toil and travail.

This is a task which I believe should command the energies and efforts of all knowledgeable citizens who are concerned about the efficient and equitable operation of our Government. It is a cause to which members of the bar and potential members of the bar can uniquely add their talents.

In the end, I am confident that the great preponderance of evidence in its favor, combined with the growing sophistication of the electorate and its representatives, will result in placing the item veto in our arsenal of constitutional powers. Vigorously and wisely applied by our Chief Executives, the result can be the saving of literally millions of dollars, wiser use of taxpayers' funds, and a more perfect functioning of the greatest system of government the mind of man has ever devised.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, April 28, 1960, at 10 a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 27, 1960:

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law:

To be captains

Abercrombie, Edward L., O76933.
 Adams, Basil R., Jr., O86982.
 Adams, John E., O88544.
 Adamson, George F., O87990.
 Adessa, Anthony J., O76935.
 Agnew, James B., O85473.
 Aguanno, Edwin M., O70580.
 Ainslie, Robert E., O69844.
 Aitken, Milton L., Jr., O70581.
 Akey, Charles D., O75133.
 Alameda, Donald J., O70582.
 Albro, Ames S., Jr., O70583.
 Allan, William L., O70584.
 Allen, Charles B., O89173.
 Alvey, Everett L., O76937.
 Amaki, Satoru, O81367.
 Anderson, Andrew H., O73283.
 Anderson, Darrell R., O70588.
 Anderson, George B., O76938.
 Anderson, Jerome H., O70589.
 Anderson, Richard V., O71754.
 Anderson, Robert C., O85122.
 Anderson, Warren H., O70161.
 Andre, Nick J., O68864.
 Andreas, Charles R., 3d., O70590.
 Andrew, Donald G., O76939.
 Anklam, Frederick M., O70591.
 Anthis, Robert F., O70592.
 Applewhite, Ray, O74627.
 Archer, William T., O70593.
 Archibald, Norman E., O79167.
 Arkley, Robert J., O80206.
 Armstrong, Raymond, O68867.
 Arnold, Thomas H., O81370.
 Asente, James, O88327.
 Atkinson, Ellis O., O68869.
 Augur, George M., O87997.
 Ault, William E., O89027.
 Avery, Cyrus S., 2d., O70595.
 Avveduti, Paul R., O68874.
 Awrey, Sherry E., O77257.
 Ayers, Theodore F., O68875.
 Back, Arthur R., O76940.
 Bacon, Willis G., O70596.
 Baddaker, William L., O76941.
 Badger, Robert W., O70597.
 Bailey, Kenneth R., O70599.
 Bailey, Ronald O., O76942.
 Bain, John R., O81372.
 Baker, Russell A., O75140.
 Baldwin, Jessie E., O74629.
 Baldwin, William R., O70600.
 Ballantyne, John L., 3d., O70601.
 Balzhiser, Robert M., O79171.
 Bard, John C., O70602.
 Barksdale, Clifford B., O81374.
 Barnes, Harold F., O70603.
 Barnes, Robert S., O81375.
 Barnes, Wilson C., O70604.
 Barnitt, George W., Jr., O71139.
 Barrand, Kerwood W., O70605.
 Barron, William T., O88563.
 Bartolacci, Alfred D., O79177.
 Bass, Richard H., O79179.
 Bauer, Daniel H., O81376.
 Baughman, Richard C., O70608.
 Bean, John F., O68888.
 Beaube, George P., O74635.
 Beaumont, Charles D., O70610.
 Beckwith, George G., O79182.
 Bedell, Norman H., O70611.
 Beers, John R., O70164.
 Belcher, Eugene R., O71759.
 Bell, Alexander D., O88567.
 Bell, Frederick D., Jr., O76949.
 Bellows, Robert E., O69856.
 Beltman, Laurence J., O78635.
 Benfer, Richard H., O70613.
 Benn, Clark H., O70614.
 Bennett, George C., Jr., O70615.
 Bennett, John C., O70616.
 Bennett, Raymond G., O76951.
 Bennett, Willard M., Jr., O79185.
 Bennetto, Edward, 2d., O84472.
 Benson, Joseph E., O71315.
 Beringer, Jack M., O70618.
 Berkey, Ronald R., O71443.
 Bernstein, Harold, O82141.
 Bidwell, Bruce W., O70619.
 Biggerstaff, Jack, O75145.
 Bildersback, Gerald, O76952.
 Billy, Myron D., O68900.
 Bishop, John G., O87678.
 Blackmore, James R., O85899.
 Blanche, John G., 3d., O81379.
 Blichmann, Donald J., O81381.
 Bockman, Leonard I., O74641.
 Bodine, James F., O79188.
 Boe, Richard I., O70622.
 Boggs, Joseph C., O72823.
 Boggs, William L., O73291.
 Bole, Albert C., Jr., O76954.
 Bonner, Laurence B., O70623.
 Bonomo, Reno J., O76956.
 Bonsall, Edward H., 3d., O82144.
 Boose, Gordon D., O70624.
 Boster, Philip L., O81382.
 Boswell, Aubrey R., O84951.
 Bowden, John C., Jr., O76958.
 Bowling, Fredrick B., O70625.
 Bowman, Joseph R., O88582.
 Boyd, Gerald M., O79192.
 Boyle, Dean G., O81384.
 Boyle, Dennis M., O76960.
 Boyle, Willard F., O84955.
 Boyle, William P., O81385.
 Bozymski, Valentine W., O77276.
 Bradbury, Donald K., O70627.
 Bradel, James F., O70628.
 Brady, James P., O76961.
 Branch, William E., O76962.
 Brandt, Leo M., O76963.
 Brant, Kenneth E., O70629.
 Brazel, David H., O75152.
 Breeding, Gene L., O70630.
 Breeding, William B., O85296.
 Brinton, John R., O81388.
 Brizee, Harry A., O71154.
 Brobeck, Irvin, Jr., O79201.
 Brock, Eldridge W., O87690.
 Brock, Mervin E., O68919.
 Brodeur, Alfred F., O81390.
 Brogan, Thomas W., O68920.
 Broman, Ralph W., O78242.
 Brookshire, Grall L., O70133.
 Broumas, Andre G., O70635.
 Brown, Charles W., O69869.
 Brown, Elmer A., O68870.
 Brown, Robert F., O79203.
 Brown, Sam A., O73437.
 Brown, Thomas C., Jr., O70637.
 Brown, Thomas D., O68458.
 Browne, Robert T., Jr., O76965.
 Browne, Roger J., 2d., O70638.
 Brownlee, Emory W., O76966.
 Buckheit, Wilbur C., O70639.
 Buckley, Fletcher J., O70640.
 Buckman, Joseph C., O79204.
 Buckner, Allen M., O73299.
 Bullock, Charles A., O84960.
 Burch, Olger D., Jr., O79205.
 Burnett, Clark A., O82151.
 Burnett, Sheldon J., O70643.
 Burnison, George E., O79206.
 Burr, Richard A., O69873.
 Burris, James C., O70644.
 Burton, Glenn E., O88602.
 Butler, Henry W., O70645.
 Button, Ronald E., Jr., O70646.
 Bynum, Donald K., O79210.
 Byrd, Roger D., O73226.
 Byrom, Robert, O68222.
 Cain, David L., O88245.
 Calciolari, Omar J., O84475.
 Caldwell, James K., O68932.
 Calhoun, George B., O70648.
 Callaway, Luke L., Jr., O70649.
 Callinan, William F., O81393.

- Callis, Bennie E., O72410.
 Campbell, Harold T., O81394.
 Campbell, Laurence A., O76972.
 Canham, Thomas R., O68464.
 Canja, Safron S., O71325.
 Cannon, Archie S., Jr., O81395.
 Carey, Gordon T., O79215.
 Carlson, Charles W., O70650.
 Carlson, Donald, O79216.
 Carlson, Earl C., O85407.
 Carlson, Gustaf R., O77306.
 Carmichael, Horace H., O73301.
 Carrasco, Valentine E., O82155.
 Carrillo, Armando E., O68944.
 Carroll, Henry S., 3d, O70653.
 Carson, David L., O76973.
 Catudal, Joe U., O70080.
 Caudle, Lester C., Jr., O79219.
 Chacon, Jose LeR., O70655.
 Chancellor, George, O70657.
 Chandler, James D., O70658.
 Chaney, Otto P., Jr., O76976.
 Chant, Robert J., O71165.
 Chapman, James L., 3d, O70659.
 Charlton, James S., O68812.
 Chesbro, John S., O70660.
 Childs, John O., O70174.
 Ching, John Y. S., O79222.
 Chirio, Michael L., Jr., O79223.
 Choat, Buddy J., O76978.
 Churchill, Ralph T., O81398.
 Cicchinelli, Robert D., O70662.
 Clark, Dallas W., O81399.
 Clark, David R., O68952.
 Clark, Densel LeJ., O88623.
 Clark, Donald O., O76982.
 Clark, Gene E., O68954.
 Cleary, Arthur C., O74660.
 Clements, John K., O79229.
 Clyburn, Thomas B., 3d, O79231.
 Coates, Fred A., O81400.
 Cochran, Jerry L., O87709.
 Cole, David A., O79233.
 Cole, Raymond F., O76985.
 Cole, William W., O73304.
 Coleman, James P., O69884.
 Collier, Alvis W., O68958.
 Collins, Howard L., O89193.
 Colpini, Frank P., O70665.
 Combs, Oliver B., Jr., O70666.
 Comer, Ralph L., O68961.
 Cone, Eugene B., O71331.
 Connors, James P., O73307.
 Conover, Nelson P., O70082.
 Conway, Edward S., O68964.
 Cook, Larry L., O87711.
 Cook, Richard R., O85141.
 Cook, Robert C., Jr., O69888.
 Cooper, James C., 3d, O70667.
 Cooper, John O., 3d, O68481.
 Cooper, Robert G., O76988.
 Cory, Billy J., O70669.
 Cose, LeRoy E., O71660.
 Cosgrove, William C., O81402.
 Costello, John L., Jr., O78576.
 Cottingham, John B., Jr., O68966.
 Cottle, Robert E., O70670.
 Cowley, John F., Jr., O73310.
 Cox, Newton C., O84478.
 Cragun, Benjamin M., O68968.
 Craig, Michael F., O71471.
 Craig, Robert B., O71775.
 Craighead, Doyle T., O69890.
 Crain, Leonard B., O82159.
 Cramer, Eugene G., O81403.
 Craver, Roger H., O72330.
 Creekmore, Billy B., O79240.
 Crisp, William H., O81404.
 Crosmun, Clifford A., O84902.
 Crouch, Harry C., O75168.
 Crown, Ray H., O70083.
 Crumit, Ellis G., O79242.
 Culver, James V., O76990.
 Cunha, Frederick R., O76991.
 Cunningham, Martin J., 2d, O73311.
 Cunningham, Walter D., O76992.
 Custer, Robert G., O82162.
 Cutole, Edward P., O70675.
 Daggett, Robert W., O73312.
 Dahl, Bruce E., O69895.
 Daniels, Tolbert A., Jr., O68975.
 Daniels, Walter C., O68976.
 Daoulas, Arthur, O85151.
 Darling, Sterling P. A., O70679.
 Daugherty, Paul R., O85152.
 Daura, John, Jr., O70676.
 Davia, Albert J., O81407.
 Davis, Bruce E., O89198.
 Davis, Edward E., O73315.
 Davis, Jack C., O85312.
 Davis, Roger H., O76995.
 Davis, Vernon K., O71478.
 DeJarnette, Larry N., O75171.
 DeRouen, Milton, Jr., O89199.
 DeSimone, Thomas E., O70680.
 Dean, Frank M. S., O70084.
 Debelius, Charles A., O70681.
 Delamain, Frederic J., O70682.
 Deming, Roger M. McP., O76997.
 Denton, Walter M., O70180.
 Derrick, George E., O68985.
 Detwiler, Harvey C., O81412.
 Diamond, Eugene M., O75174.
 Diener, Everett P., O88655.
 Diesu, Angelo J., O79253.
 Diggory, Mark L., O79255.
 Diller, Richard W., O70684.
 Dimick, David L., O70685.
 Doby, Robert F., O7001.
 Dolif, Eugene, O87732.
 Donnelly, Eugene M., O70686.
 Downen, Robert E., O70687.
 Doyle, William P., O77005.
 Drake, Michael D., O70688.
 Driscoll, Paul C., O70689.
 Drisko, Shapleigh M., O70690.
 Drumm, Donald R., O81416.
 Duncan, Jack L., O81418.
 Duncan, Ross E., O68998.
 Dunn, James F., Jr., O73320.
 Dure, John H., O84480.
 Dyer, Gerald D., O81420.
 Ealer, George L., O69002.
 Eaton, Prescott, O70089.
 Eberhard, Floyd, O88666.
 Eberhart, Loren M., O70693.
 Eberle, John S., O71486.
 Eckhart, John W., 3d, O71487.
 Edmonds, Maurice O., O77007.
 Edwards, William H., O69909.
 Eitel, John C., O70697.
 Eldred, Marshall S., O77008.
 Ellingwood, Dean C., O79574.
 Ellis, Mike, O81421.
 Ellis, William L., O84982.
 Ellis, William T., O77011.
 Elmore, Louis N., O69010.
 Elton, Robert M., O70699.
 Eng, Charles, O71178.
 Engram, Edwin J., O74684.
 Ennis, John A., O79266.
 Enright, Eugene J., O82168.
 Epling, William Y., O70700.
 Espin, Willard B., O74686.
 Estep, Willis H., O88377.
 Etheridge, James R., O70182.
 Eubanks, James M., O89054.
 Evans, Herbert C., O87736.
 Ewing, Leroy B., O89055.
 Falk, Dale R., O77014.
 Farmer, Richard A., O70703.
 Farrar, John H., Jr., O70704.
 Farris, John T., O71180.
 Felike, Glenn T., O69019.
 Fellabaum, John N., O69022.
 Fellerhoff, John H., O79273.
 Fellows, Robert L., O81423.
 Ferguson, James H., O77016.
 Ferullo, Generoso J., O81424.
 Ficks, Filmore L., O74003.
 Finehout, Arthur W., O77388.
 Finley, John L., O81425.
 Finney, Don E., O75184.
 Fitzgerald, Thomas W., O79277.
 Flanigan, Clifford T., O70706.
 Flickinger, Robert E., O79280.
 Flynn, Thomas J., O85323.
 Foley, William R., O72332.
 Font, George M., O73329.
 Forbes, Barney H., O77022.
 Ford, Richard L., O69922.
 Forman, Robert C., O70707.
 Fowler, Roy, O68538.
 Fowler, Thomas R., O77024.
 Francis, John K., O71184.
 Francis, Phillip M., O77025.
 Francols, Frank, O82172.
 Franklin, Charles D., O77026.
 Franklin, James D., O70091.
 Fritchman, Lynn V., O88688.
 Froede, Carl R., O69036.
 Fronczak, Theodore J., O88689.
 Fuerst, Werner F., O81431.
 Fulk, Emmett A., O87519.
 Fuller, Leonard H., Jr., O70709.
 Gabardi, David L., O77028.
 Gabbert, Howard M., 2d, O70710.
 Gabel, James M., O70092.
 Gager, William A., Jr., O70712.
 Gallagher, Thomas M., O88693.
 Galliher, Kay D., O73332.
 Galloway, Frederick M., O70713.
 Galvin, John R., O70714.
 Galyon, Norman L., O79289.
 Ganahl, Joseph, O70715.
 Garcia, John L., O69927.
 Gardner, William S., O81433.
 Gassaway, Kenton C., O69931.
 Gaston, Donald E., O70717.
 Gatti, Raymond E., O79293.
 Gazlay, John C., O81436.
 Gelster, Duane A., O75190.
 Geraci, John F., O79295.
 Gerda, Joseph J., O70720.
 Gernon, Thomas E., 3d, O77029.
 Gettings, Theodore C., O75191.
 Gheen, John W., Jr., O70721.
 Gil, Osvaldo L., O70093.
 Gilbert, Wendell H., O70723.
 Gilboux, John W., O70724.
 Giles, George R., O71089.
 Gillespie, John T., O73335.
 Gillingham, Richard I., O79299.
 Gillis, John B., O69043.
 Gilmore, Edward R., O82174.
 Gimple, Lloyd A., O79300.
 Ginn, Louis H., 3d, O70726.
 Glover, Alfred P., O83625.
 Glover, Rupert F., O79302.
 Godwin, Ralph L., O79303.
 Godwin, William C., O69049.
 Goetzmann, Philip A., O75193.
 Gomez, Robert M., O70727.
 Good, James A., O77031.
 Goode, Franklyn C., O75194.
 Goode, Ralph W., Jr., O81441.
 Goodman, Wilbur G., O81443.
 Goodsite, Thomas M., O84483.
 Goodwin, Clifton R., O79306.
 Goodwin, Robert E., O70728.
 Gorvad, Peter L., O69051.
 Goss, Ephriam M., O72716.
 Goss, Wallace F., Jr., O82176.
 Grace, William F., 3d, O70730.
 Graham, James R., O83626.
 Graham, Jones R., O83627.
 Greeley, John M., O81445.
 Green, Alfred W., O81446.
 Green, David E., O74703.
 Green, Richard D., O69053.
 Green, William T., O77033.
 Greer, Richard B., O74704.
 Gregerson, William E., O77034.
 Griffin, Richard W., O70735.
 Griffith, Joseph K., O77035.
 Grinder, Richard H., Jr., O70736.
 Griswold, Donald E., O69059.
 Gross, Robert H., O70739.
 Grubbs, Brandt F., O70740.
 Guenther, Leo A., O82178.
 Guidroz, Evans J., O75200.
 Guy, George S., Jr., O70741.
 Guyton, Robert E., O82179.
 Gwin, Walter C., O88084.
 Haas, Viri E., O70742.
 Haeussler, Rodolfo, O68351.
 Hall, Harry E., O77038.
 Hall, Sayward N., Jr., O70743.
 Hallenbeck, David R., O81448.
 Haller, Douglas L., O77039.
 Halliday, Samuel L., O70744.
 Halsted, Robert E., O81449.

Halvatgis, James N., O70745.
 Ham, Lewis H., Jr., O70746.
 Hampel, Victor H., O77426.
 Hampton, Wade, O70747.
 Hance, Carl W., O87774.
 Hannas, Robert, O82181.
 Hannaway, Harold C., O81451.
 Hannon, Clarence W., O70748.
 Hannum, David B., Jr., O77041.
 Harber, Gerald J., O75204.
 Hardy, Herbert F., Jr., O71092.
 Harman, Asher W., Jr., O79319.
 Harmon, Tommy J., O77042.
 Harper, William B., O70751.
 Harris, David F., O70752.
 Hart, Franklin A., O70754.
 Hartert, Richard A., O84485.
 Hartman, Donald F., O88721.
 Harvey, Alton H., O88723.
 Hathaway, Warren A., O77045.
 Hauser, William L., O70757.
 Haws, Elbert D., O73343.
 Hayes, Alva W., O69070.
 Hayes Walter F., O75206.
 Haynes, Harvey R., O88091.
 Hays, James E., O70758.
 Healy, Thomas F., Jr., O70759.
 Heath, Arthur M., O73501.
 Hedgepeth, Leroy J., O87532.
 Hellmuth, Harry E., O77047.
 Henderson, Berry H., O85562.
 Henry, James R., O70760.
 Herring, Shelby D., O88733.
 Heverly, Clifford C., O72374.
 Heyward, James O., O79324.
 Hickey, Thomas B., O79325.
 Hicks, Franklin D., O70761.
 Higgins, Alan R., O74722.
 Hight, Adolph A., O69948.
 Hill, Clarence O., O84488.
 Hillsman, Dan A., O69080.
 Hilsman, William J., O70763.
 Hilt, George H., O70764.
 Hincke, John I., Jr., O70765.
 Hingst, John M., O73345.
 Hobbs, Guy E., Jr., O79327.
 Hobbs, Leo P., O70766.
 Hobbs, Richard W., O70767.
 Hoffert, Charles E., O77451.
 Holder, John B., O81458.
 Hole, James A., O82336.
 Holland, David K., O81459.
 Holler, John C., O81460.
 Holloway, James E., O82337.
 Holloway, Teddy G., O79329.
 Holtam, David N., O70768.
 Horlitz, Alfred E., O71522.
 Hormann, Vaughn A., O79331.
 Hornsby, Jesse S., O71208.
 Horwedel, Alan T., O68577.
 Houk, William H., O69091.
 Houy, Edward W., Jr., O69092.
 Howard, Newman A., Jr., O69094.
 Howard, Samuel A., O76243.
 Hoy, Richard P., O70770.
 Hoyer, Max J., O84490.
 Hubp, Frank, O88746.
 Hudachek, John W., O70771.
 Hughes, Norman J., O79336.
 Hugo, Victor J., Jr., O70772.
 Hungerford, Franklin M., O71810.
 Hunt, Robert L., O70773.
 Hurtubise, William, O79338.
 Hutchens, Douglas L., O88109.
 Hutchenson, Dwight R., O69099.
 Hyatt, Frederic D., O84492.
 Ianni, Francis A., O70774.
 Ice, Ronald E., O69101.
 Ingram, Thomas A., O69102.
 Ironside, Robert A., O70775.
 Jackson, Wilfred A., O69108.
 Jackson, William S., O87801.
 Jacobitz, John P., Jr., O71814.
 Jacobsen, Richard L., O79342.
 Jacquez, Oscar S., O70100.
 Janairo, Maximiano R., Jr., O70776.
 Janssen, Arlo D., O77055.
 Jauch, Raymond M., Jr., O71372.
 Jeffers, Sam E. Jr., O77056.
 Jenne, Dale E., O70778.
 Jessee, William T., O70779.
 Johnson, Dion, O70780.
 Johnson, James R. L., O70781.
 Johnson, Peter W., O70782.
 Johnson, Robert H., O70102.
 Johnston, Johnny J., O73349.
 Jolley, Alvin L., O71683.
 Jones, Charles R., O77060.
 Jones, Daryl D., O70783.
 Jones, George E., Jr., O81465.
 Jones, Glenn W., O74739.
 Jones, Glenwood E., O88271.
 Jones, John R., O81466.
 Jones, Peter G., O70785.
 Jones, Richard A., O77061.
 Jones, Robert P., O69958.
 Jongebloed, Nicholas H., O74740.
 Jordan, William R., O85337.
 Judd, Edward O., O70786.
 Kallellis, James S., O69120.
 Kampschror, Darrell B., O71818.
 Kavanaugh, Richard D., O70788.
 Kavanaugh, William, O77064.
 Kay, Joseph V., O88764.
 Keaton, Jack L., O73353.
 Keener, Robert E., O70789.
 Keiser, Edwin C., O70790.
 Keith, Harlan A., O80215.
 Kelly, Clifford B., O77066.
 Kelman, Manfred, O87817.
 Kent, John F., O77067.
 Kersh, Fred, Jr., O70791.
 Ketteman, Rollin L., O82194.
 Kincaid, Jack D., O70792.
 King, Charles R., O71215.
 King, William W., O70201.
 Kingery, Michael I., O85193.
 Kinne, Milton J., Jr., O71819.
 Kinney, Philip R., O74747.
 Kirby, James W., O71535.
 Kirby, William D., Jr., O70793.
 Kirkland, Paris E., O77068.
 Kitchin, Herbert A., O69131.
 Klein, William E., O70796.
 Klick, Clyde F., O84494.
 Klिंगenfus, Emil J., O70770.
 Klippel, Kenneth L., O77071.
 Klora, David J., O87824.
 Knight, Bobby M., O71216.
 Knoff, Edward M., Jr., O70799.
 Koehler, William F., O77074.
 Komornik, Ronald G., O75225.
 Korpala, Eugene S., O75227.
 Kortum, Marvin R., O70800.
 Korts, Leon L., O70801.
 Koun, John N., O70803.
 Kourakos, George S., O70804.
 Kramer, Kenneth R., O70805.
 Kratsch, Charles H., O69966.
 Krueger, William H., O77076.
 Kvernes, Roger W., O69137.
 Labourdette, Albert H., Jr., O71540.
 Lachance, Martin P., O70809.
 Lackey, Marvin E., O81473.
 Lacour, George A., O70810.
 Lacy, James F., O89239.
 Lafever, Morris, O79358.
 Lambert, Richard T., O77079.
 Landau, Bernard M., O81475.
 Lane, James C., Jr., O69146.
 Langford, Paul P., O82196.
 Lanier, Albert B., Jr., O77081.
 Lanphere, Robert F., O77082.
 Larsen, John W., O77083.
 Larson, Harry D., O73452.
 Lasher, Sebastian A., O70811.
 Laskowski, Frank W., O79361.
 Laucirica, Xavier A., Jr., O69150.
 Laverty, Wayne B., O71381.
 Lawrence, William J., O70104.
 Lax, Joseph O., Jr., O77085.
 Lay, Gilbert E., O77523.
 Laybourn, William E., O69154.
 Le Clair, William J., O77088.
 LeMere, John R., O70813.
 Leathers, Billy J., O77087.
 Ledford, William V., O77089.
 Lee, Lynn L., O73364.
 Lee, Ronald B., O70814.
 Lees, Robert E., O77090.
 Leese, Donald A., O77091.
 Leiser, Maurice H., O70815.
 Leister, Richard W., O88122.
 Leland, David P., O77092.
 Lemanski, Ronald J., O70816.
 Lenard, Stanley, O69161.
 Leonard, Dan S., O88785.
 Leone, Peter N., 2d, O70817.
 Leszczynski, Joseph J., O73366.
 Lethcoe, Dale L., O79363.
 Leva, Neil I., O81479.
 Levensky, Emil E., O70818.
 Levine, Edwin R., O88280.
 Lewis, John P., O77093.
 Ley, Robert E., O70819.
 Lieber, Albert C., Jr., O70820.
 Lilley, Aaron L., Jr., O85027.
 Lilly, Richard A., O84497.
 Lindsay, James J., O75235.
 Lindsey, Fred S., O70821.
 Lindsey, Tommy G., O77095.
 Littlefield, Richard E., O70822.
 Loane, Jabez W., 4th, O78597.
 Lobbell, Edward D., Jr., O79366.
 Lochner, Jack A., O70823.
 Logan, Jack R., O70825.
 Long, James L., O73367.
 Lovato, Lawrence L., O78598.
 Lowe, Orin H., O77097.
 Lowery, Carlton M., O77098.
 Lowrey, Patrick, O88424.
 Lucas, Andre C., O70827.
 Luce, Charles McC., Jr., O70828.
 Luepnitz, Carl A., O77101.
 Lummis, Mason M., O86433.
 Lykke, Arthur F., Jr., O70831.
 Lynch, Homer M., O69170.
 Mackey, William C., Jr., O89098.
 Macklin, Joseph D., O70832.
 Madigan, John J., 3d, O74763.
 Maga, Fred D., O77102.
 Mahoney, Francis X., O70106.
 Mallia, Louis A., O84498.
 Mallo, Harry R., O77103.
 Mallonee, John B., Jr., O77104.
 Malmgren, Alfred C., O77105.
 Malone, Dandridge M., O71832.
 Maloney, James P., O71386.
 Mangold, Clarence A., Jr., O81481.
 Mann, William M., Jr., O72757.
 Marcum, Robert H., O70835.
 Marcus, John E., O70836.
 Marcy, Edwin J., Jr., O72928.
 Marini, James L., O88807.
 Marker, Robert H., O77107.
 Marrow, James E., O79371.
 Martellini, Carmen R., O77108.
 Martin, Haywood H., O69199.
 Martin, James R., O79372.
 Martin, Jesse H., 3d, O70837.
 Martin, John E., O88810.
 Martin, Quinton T., Jr., O88811.
 Marvin, Ernest A., Jr., O70839.
 Mason, Elijah F., O79374.
 Massaro, Joseph M., O70840.
 Massengill, James R., O85033.
 Massey, Joseph O., Jr., O69979.
 Masters, Barrie P., O72759.
 Masuck, Joseph, O70841.
 Matsumoto, Glenn K., O70842.
 Matthews, Lloyd J., O70843.
 Matthias, Norman A., Jr., O70845.
 Mattmuller, Norman A., O70846.
 Mayberry, Thomas S., O70848.
 Mayer, David E., O79375.
 Mayhew, John W., O87555.
 Mays, Robert E., O73372.
 McBee, Willie H., O70107.
 McCarthy, Richard J., O70108.
 McClusky, James D., O71836.
 McCollum, Richard W., O81485.
 McConnell, Lewis J., O84499.
 McCord, John S., O75247.
 McCormick, Richard L., O85349.
 McCoy, Don S., O69176.
 McCrea, J. Hollis V., Jr., O77112.
 McCue, James A., O79376.
 McDonald, Payton R., Jr., O75394.
 McDonnell, Gerald F. E., O88453.
 McDowell, Rowland F., O87850.
 McDuffee, David P., O81486.
 McGee, Calvin A., O85041.
 McGraw, John F., Jr., O89105.

- McGraw, Russell M., O85350.
 McGreevy, Edgar R., O82207.
 McGuire, William E., Jr., O70852.
 McKay, Kevin E., O88541.
 McKay, William L., O73374.
 McKenzie, Moran A., O69985.
 McKie, Robert G., O69183.
 McKnight, James R., O73375.
 McLaughlin, Thomas J., O74772.
 McLean, Raymond O., O88287.
 McLennan, Richard, O84500.
 McPherson, Robert M., O70857.
 McRill, Billy I., O83105.
 McSorley, Lester F., O71559.
 McTigue, Donald H., O77121.
 Meador, Marion F., O70858.
 Meadows, Thomas R., O69202.
 Means, John A., O82208.
 Meese, John R., O71839.
 Meggison, Robert H., O69205.
 Meister, Melvin E., O71099.
 Mellinger, Dale E., O67943.
 Mendenhall, Robert L., O74773.
 Menetrey, Louis C., O71395.
 Mentillo, Louis R., O70859.
 Merklinger, George J., O88290.
 Merrick, Philip B., O74775.
 Metzger, Ronald W., O88832.
 Meyer, Harvey B., O84223.
 Meyer, Richard W., O84915.
 Mickle, Franklin O., O69218.
 Milburn, Lloyd E., O79385.
 Miller, Charles E., Jr., O70861.
 Miller, George F., O77124.
 Miller, Harold L., O89261.
 Miller, Harvey F., O77126.
 Miller, James M., O70862.
 Miller, John T., O70863.
 Miller, Kenneth M., O77127.
 Miller, Paul, Jr., O70864.
 Miller, Richard J., O85046.
 Miller, Thomas A., Jr., O70112.
 Minturn, Lindsey B., O70866.
 Mitchell, Alphonso, O70143.
 Mitchell, William T., O87569.
 Mix, James E., O81493.
 Mizell, Dan J., O70214.
 Mizell, John J., Jr., O82210.
 Mock, Newell A., Jr., O79386.
 Modica, Donald, O77128.
 Monroe, Charles A., O77130.
 Mooney, Harley F., Jr., O77131.
 Mooney, Robert, O71233.
 Moore, Gordon E., O70145.
 Moore, James E., Jr., O70869.
 Moore, Patrick J., O69226.
 Moore, Pierce M., O69227.
 Moore, Richard E., O69228.
 Moore, Robert O., O69229.
 Morn, Charles P., O71234.
 Morrill, Donald P., O81494.
 Morrill, George H., O77133.
 Morris, Henry F., O85222.
 Morris, Robert P., O70872.
 Morrison, Patton N., O68648.
 Morsey, James A., O69236.
 Morton, Jack E., O68649.
 Moseley, Robert L., O79392.
 Moses, Edward M., O70874.
 Moses, William C., O69994.
 Mosher, David L., O79393.
 Mott, Carl M., Jr., O69995.
 Mountain, Benjamin, O73379.
 Moxley, Robert J., O79394.
 Mullen, Jack L., O79395.
 Mullins, Thomas E., O70441.
 Mulvanity, Donald C., O74786.
 Munn, William R., O77138.
 Murphy, Alvin F., O77139.
 Murphy, James K., O79397.
 Musser, John B., O79398.
 Mustain, James C., O77141.
 Muth, Roy W., O70878.
 Nagorski, Walter J., O71405.
 Neff, Owen B., O77143.
 Negris, Rocco, O77144.
 Neu, Dick D., O68657.
 Neu, George T., O70881.
 Newnham, Donald F., O70882.
 Nicholson, Rowland J., O79402.
 Nicholson, Thomas G., O85053.
 Niemi, John A., O75260.
 Nix, Eddie M., O89116.
 Noffsinger, Gordon A., O79404.
 Nolan, John R., O81499.
 Nolin, Edmond R., O70004.
 Norgard, Donald R., O79406.
 North, Jerold M., O70883.
 Northcutt, Maurice, O85056.
 Nosek, George F., O87574.
 Nowak, Donald E., O70884.
 Nowalk, Charles L., O82216.
 Nutter, Raymond T., O79407.
 Oakes, James R., O70217.
 O'Brien, George F., Jr., O70885.
 Odom, William E., O70888.
 Old, William D., 2d, O70889.
 Oliver, Henry McC., O77150.
 O'Malley, John M., O73383.
 Openchowski, Kenneth F. A., O81501.
 O'Quinn, James J., O69256.
 Ormsby, Mark A., O70891.
 Orr, Charles E., Jr., O84503.
 Orr, Charles R., O70892.
 Owens, Joe S., O73384.
 Owens, Warren R., O69259.
 Pace, Ray D., O70894.
 Page, Harold R., O81504.
 Palastra, Joseph T., Jr., O70895.
 Palermo, Frank J., Jr., O74799.
 Palmer, Warren T., O70896.
 Palumbo, Joseph E., O70897.
 Panageas, Dan P., O70007.
 Panzer, Donald F., O70898.
 Pappageorge, John G., O70899.
 Parini, Romano J., O79413.
 Parker, Hassel L., O73385.
 Parker, Russell W., O70901.
 Partridge, Charles C., O77151.
 Partridge, Edward A., O70902.
 Pascarella, Pascal W., O81507.
 Passmore, Edwin E., O70903.
 Patterson, Mercer H., O70904.
 Patton, Eugene H., O75263.
 Paul, William V., Jr., O70905.
 Pauley, Francis L., O69264.
 Pawlowski, Edward J. P., O70906.
 Paxman, James C., O79417.
 Payne, Thomas L., O79419.
 Peisinger, Roman J., Jr., O70907.
 Penney, Hubert F., O77621.
 Percy, Francis J., O70908.
 Perkins, Andrew D., Jr., O82219.
 Perkins, Rodney B., O82220.
 Perrin, Everett I., Jr., O75264.
 Perrin, George E., O70909.
 Person, David E., O71712.
 Persons, George A., O79420.
 Peters, Billy, O77154.
 Petersen, Peter B., O79421.
 Peterson, Jon H., O82222.
 Peyton, Cary R., O70911.
 Philbrick, Donald F., O72774.
 Phillips, Benjamin M., 3d, O85360.
 Phillips, John C., O68674.
 Phillips, Ted N., O77158.
 Piepho, Carlton D., O79425.
 Pies, Donald A., O70016.
 Piolunek, Chester J., O70913.
 Plencner, Francis B., O88877.
 Poarch, James W., Jr., O71111.
 Poel, David J., O77160.
 Pole, Freddie R., O81509.
 Ponder, William L., Jr., O79430.
 Pope, William A., O77161.
 Porter, Clair E., O72968.
 Porter, Donald C., O70915.
 Porter, John G., O70916.
 Portteus, Willard L., Jr., O70114.
 Poteat, John A., Jr., O70917.
 Powers, Paul V., O70918.
 Prescott, Warren T., O77628.
 Price, Francis K., Jr., O77165.
 Price, Tommy E., O70115.
 Proctor, Lawrence B., O77166.
 Proietto, Raymond T., O73111.
 Prokopowich, Lucien F., O77167.
 Fuckette, Cecil L., O84067.
 Purdy, John T., O70922.
 Pursell, Alfred B., O77170.
 Qualls, Orkun F., Jr., O70923.
 Quinn, William J., O79436.
 Radke, Galen W., O77172.
 Ragains, Robert L., O74818.
 Ralls, Dan H., O70023.
 Ralph James R., Jr., O81513.
 Randall, Starr D., O85074.
 Ransone, James F., Jr., O70925.
 Rapkoch, James M., O77638.
 Ratcliff, Walter A., O79439.
 Rathburn, Vinton L., O72779.
 Rathnatu, Donald P., O70024.
 Rawlings, Charles R., O70026.
 Rayl, Wallace L., O82227.
 Reddell, Eugene B., O79440.
 Redic, Maxie O., Jr., O84507.
 Reding, Charles H., O75275.
 Reed, Edwin, Jr., O68683.
 Reed, Leonard F. B., Jr., O70926.
 Reed, Robert T., O70927.
 Reese, Mark L., Jr., O70928.
 Reid, Frederick L., Jr., O71413.
 Reising, Glenn M., Jr., O81515.
 Remus, Melvyn D., O70930.
 Renfro, Richard M., O70931.
 Resley, Robert D., O70932.
 Revis, Blaine A., O79443.
 Rhea, Donald M., O70933.
 Rhodes, Cephus S., O77178.
 Rice, Harrold E., O73389.
 Richard, Alan V., O70934.
 Richards, Charles D., O70935.
 Richards, Howard C., O77180.
 Richards, Joseph F., O85366.
 Ricker, Norman H., Jr., O73390.
 Ridgway, John J., Jr., O77182.
 Riede, James R., O69295.
 Riese, Robert C., O70936.
 Rife, Byard W., O69298.
 Riley, Frank J., O70027.
 Riley, Walter G., Jr., O70227.
 Rios, Albert J., O84508.
 Ripple, Larry M., O77652.
 Ritz, Karl C., O79445.
 Roberts, Norman L., O79446.
 Robinson, Hugh G., O70937.
 Robinson, James B., O70029.
 Robinson, Robert E., O75279.
 Roderick, Edward E., O70938.
 Rodgers, Sterling McG., O69305.
 Rogers, Clare R., O77184.
 Rogers, John C., O70939.
 Rogers, Robert F., O70030.
 Rogers, Roland B., O74827.
 Rollinger, Jack R., O69308.
 Roper, Charles A., O79447.
 Rorke, Donald M., O71260.
 Rose, Myron W., O70940.
 Rose, Ronald J., O75280.
 Rosen, Leslie M., O69310.
 Rosing, Willis S., Jr., O79449.
 Ross, Robert L., O79450.
 Rouchon, Anthony C., Jr., O82229.
 Routh, Harry M., O77186.
 Royals, William C., O70942.
 Rudser, John L., O69312.
 Rue, Norman L., O73393.
 Rufe, Charles P., O79453.
 Ruhf, Harry F., O70944.
 Ruiz, Ronald R., O81517.
 Rumsey, Frank A., Jr., O75281.
 Ruskauff, Donald R., O85371.
 Ruth, Charles W., O85799.
 Ryan, Dennis W., Jr., O75282.
 Ryan, James P., O70945.
 Sachs, Arthur, O71864.
 Salvador, Ronald L., O70948.
 Samouce, Warren A., O70949.
 Sampson, Edward E., O79457.
 Sanders, Bobby L., O77188.
 Sanders, Drexel E., O71595.
 Sandia, Robert S., O82232.
 Schaefer, John R., Jr., O89287.
 Schaefer, Rolland M., O77670.
 Schludecker, Otto A., O75288.
 Schmidt, Theodore H., O69321.
 Schneider, George J., O77191.
 Schoen, Frank C., O82234.
 Schoendorfer, Frank S., O82235.
 Schoening, George W., O71718.
 Schweikert, Paul, Jr., O70953.
 Scibilia, Anthony J., O75290.
 Scott, Charles G., O71269.
 Scott, Hugh A., O81521.
 Scovel, James L., O70954.

Seale, Billy G., O79466.
 Seaman, Richard T., O79467.
 Searls, Billie E., O69329.
 Seay, Jefferson 3d., O71719.
 Segrest, William D., O77193.
 Serven, Harold M., Jr., O70035.
 Sessions, Jerrald M., O77681.
 Sessler, James R., Jr., O75292.
 Severance, Fayette L., Jr., O79469.
 Shafer, John C., O70955.
 Shallcross, George, O83633.
 Shaughnessy, Thomas J., O81523.
 Shaw, Donald P., O70956.
 Shay, Patrick E., O77195.
 Shebat, Donald, O70957.
 Shedden, Eckols L., O70036.
 Sheider, Augustus L., Jr., O82237.
 Sherron, Gene T., O74841.
 Shields, George D., O77197.
 Sholar, Michael B., O69335.
 Short, Audrey J. W., O70959.
 Short, Robert B., Jr., O70960.
 Shugart, Henry G., O84068.
 Sikorski, Bennie W., O88309.
 Simmons, Marvin E., O69338.
 Simpson, Claude S., O69340.
 Sims, Roy D., O77200.
 Skeen, Henry G., O79477.
 Skibbie, Lawrence F., O70964.
 Skinker, Harry J., O85259.
 Slater, Burt E., O77202.
 Slater, James J., O69342.
 Slesnick, Bruce W., O85377.
 Sloan, James H., Jr., O70965.
 Slocombe, Donald K., O71871.
 Smith, Albert J., O77203.
 Smith, Bill J., O70039.
 Smith, Donald L., O69350.
 Smith, Donald L., O73404.
 Smith, Douglas S., O71725.
 Smith, George E., O77204.
 Smith, John A., O74846.
 Smith, Julian H., O69351.
 Smith, Marion G., O73405.
 Smith, Robert W., O81529.
 Snyder, Clinton W., O77205.
 Snyder, Quay C., O70967.
 Sorrels, Charles V., O70122.
 Spang, Alan W., O79482.
 Spence, Craig H., O70968.
 Spence, Thomas H., O79484.
 Spradlin, Glenn D., O77210.
 Springman, Robert W., O77699.
 Sprull, James P., O70969.
 Spry, Alfred E., O74853.
 Stallings, Joseph L., O69358.
 Stamper, James M., Jr., O89294.
 Stanberry, Billy M., O71876.
 Stanton, Martin P., O77211.
 Starkey, James E., O88957.
 Ste Marie, Normand A., O85674.
 Steckbauer, Curtis, O81533.
 Stedman, William R., O81534.
 Steed, Robert B., O79487.
 Stein, Henry J., Jr., O69360.
 Stelmachowicz, Peter J., O79488.
 Stenehjem, George N., O70974.
 Stephens, James E., O71727.
 Stephenson, Lamar V., O77213.
 Sterling, Allan C., O70975.
 Sterzik, Wilfred L., O69364.
 Stevenson, Leroy P., O69366.
 Stevenson, Thomas A., O74855.
 Stewart, Dennie W., Jr., O77214.
 Stewart, Denzil S., O85089.
 Stewart, John K., O71286.
 Stewart, Robert R., O70977.
 Stodter, Charles S., Jr., O70978.
 Stokinger, Richard H., O79492.
 Storrs, Charles E., Jr., O70980.
 Stotser, Don M., O69370.
 Stout, Glen W., O70981.
 Stout, Herald F., Jr., O70982.
 Strand, Vincent W., O73411.
 Stuart, Douglas B., O70984.
 Sugg, Richard H., O70987.
 Sulik, John A., O70988.
 Sullivan, Harry E. B., O70989.
 Sullivan, William F., O81539.
 Sunell, Robert J., O82240.
 Surber, James W., O70990.
 Swaren, John W., Jr., O70991.
 Swisher, Robert K., O77219.
 Sylvester, Charles E., O84515.
 Takahashi, Lawrence N., O69376.
 Talley, John D., Jr., O70050.
 Tanner, Lester W., O88968.
 Tawes, Robert H., O70993.
 Teberg, David T., O70994.
 Terry, Richard T., O71288.
 Thomas, John D., O81544.
 Thomas, Julius O., Jr., O70996.
 Thomas, Patrick E., O79502.
 Thompson, Bill T., O70997.
 Thompson, Kenneth R., O69385.
 Thompson, Richard W., O71733.
 Thoreson, David P., O70998.
 Thornton, James F., O82370.
 Thorpe, John C., O77220.
 Thorpe, Marion E., O79503.
 Thrall, Dewell O., O84514.
 Thurman, Maxwell R., O70125.
 Tinsley, Philip, Jr., O71613.
 Tippet, Jesse R., Jr., O71000.
 Tobin, Daniel J., O71001.
 Todd, Harold C., O79504.
 Tomsen, Willis C., O71002.
 Torsen, Lowell E., O71003.
 Townsley, Richard W., O71004.
 Trava, John E., O82248.
 Traxler, Grady M., O71617.
 Troutman, Gregory L., O77223.
 Tucker, Charles E., O77224.
 Tunmire, Dana, O74873.
 Turner, James McV., Jr., O70240.
 Tyler, Richard B., O71006.
 Uhrig, Richard A., O81546.
 Ulrich, Charles F., O74875.
 Underhill, Victor S., Jr., O77226.
 Underwood, Andrew F., O71007.
 Van Sickle, James P., O77227.
 Van Valkenburg, Gerald E., O71009.
 Van Vranken, Robert L., O71291.
 Vaughn, Luther C., O79508.
 Vermillion, Lewin E., O79510.
 Vesser, Dale A., O71010.
 Vidrick, Robert L., O74878.
 Vinson, Newell E., O71012.
 Visscher, Robert E., O77228.
 Vorba, Richard G., O73419.
 Vose, Donald M., O81548.
 Wagner, Louis C., Jr., O71013.
 Walker, Samuel P., 3d., O71015.
 Wall, Frank B. Jr., O74881.
 Wall, Henry L., Jr., O85383.
 Wallace, Danny C., O75312.
 Wallace, William L., O71016.
 Walters, Howard C., Jr., O84069.
 Walton, Ben L., O77230.
 Ward, Floyd J., Jr., O71740.
 Ware, Fletcher K., Jr., O71018.
 Warf, Elmer R., O71741.
 Wash, William B., O81552.
 Washer, Robert J., O71019.
 Watkins, James E., O71297.
 Watkins, William W., Jr., O73422.
 Watlington, Thomas M., 3d., O71020.
 Watson, Jack D., O73423.
 Watson, James M., O69405.
 Watson, Ronald J., O87964.
 Watts, William E., O73425.
 Weaver, William J., O71021.
 Weall, Robert H., O69408.
 Weathersby, Russell A., O77231.
 Weaver, Richard L., O71024.
 Webb, John F., Jr., O85696.
 Weeks, Frederick H., O71298.
 Weeks, Robert E., O71026.
 Weidenthal, Carlton P., O69412.
 Weinstein, Kenneth, O77232.
 Weinstein, Saundra, O79519.
 Wells, Robert W., O71027.
 Wells, Roy D., O79520.
 Welsch, Hanno F., Jr., O77770.
 West, Kenneth L., O81554.
 West, Pleasant H., O87663.
 Westervelt, John R., Jr., O71029.
 Westphal, Ralph E., O85099.
 Whalen, John J., Jr., O82376.
 Whaley, Zachary, O81555.
 Whitaker, Malvern R., O71299.
 White, Ulysses X., O79527.
 White, Walter J., O69420.
 Whitehead, Ruby L., 3d., O81556.
 Whitley, James R., O71031.
 Whittington, Richard H., O69422.
 Whittington, Wesley, O69423.
 Wilcox, Robert L., Jr., O70066.
 Wilkins, Eugene E., O69425.
 Wilkins, Julian A., O69426.
 Wilks, Clarence D., O75318.
 Williams, Billie G., O81558.
 Williams, Edmund R., O75320.
 Williams, Franklin, O69427.
 Williams, Herbert E., O71032.
 Williams, Howard M., O70158.
 Williams, Jacob A., O83830.
 Williams, James A., O71033.
 Williams, Lawrence A., O74892.
 Williams, William H., O78198.
 Williamson, Richard, O69428.
 Williamson, Thomas L., O81560.
 Williamson, William E., O69429.
 Williford, Henry G., O79534.
 Willmann, William J., O77237.
 Willner, Larry E., O71034.
 Willwerth, Dean R., O82257.
 Wilson, Dennis F., O69434.
 Wilson, Dwight L., O70067.
 Wilson, Francis V., O69435.
 Wilson, Parks W., Jr., O74894.
 Wilson, Robert D., O77238.
 Wilson, Robert E., O71307.
 Wilson, Walter C., Jr., O77239.
 Wise, David L., O71629.
 Wisniewski, John A., O71037.
 Witt, John R., O77240.
 Wittered, Peter F., O71038.
 Wolfe, Oren, O70069.
 Wong, Alfred M. K., O77241.
 Wood, Charles D., O71039.
 Woodbury, Grayson C., O71040.
 Woodruff, Albert R., O73431.
 Woodyard, John H., O71041.
 Wooge, Luvern J., O71042.
 Woolaver, Philip A., O7432.
 Worthy, William W., Jr., O79539.
 Wright, Bruce T., O82258.
 Wright, Elden H., O81563.
 Wright, Lewis W., O79541.
 Wyatt, James E., O71632.
 Wyatt, Lloyd L., O81565.
 York, Dor J., O71043.
 Young, Clyde A., Jr., O70070.
 Young, George D., O73433.
 Young, John G., O71044.
 Young, Robert L., O77243.
 Young, Roy J., O70129.
 Young, Thomas C., O71045.
 Yunker, Sylvester J., O71900.
 Zapata, Roland T., O79543.
 Zeleznikar, Louis J., O81567.
 Ziegler, Richard G., O71046.

To be captains, Chaplain

Ambrose, George, Jr., O88552.
 Anderson, Robert C., O85836.
 Brooks, Tommy C., O89035.
 Clark, Albert V., O85989.
 Cook, Richard G., O88634.
 Degl, Joseph, Jr., O88651.
 Eppershank, John P., Jr., O86127.
 Everett, Paul P., O86129.
 Forsythe, Walter DeM., O85749.
 Garner, Calvin H., O88694.
 Green, John E., O88711.
 Harding, Richard M., O86222.
 Harrell, Ralph E., O86226.
 Hartman, Richard W., O88722.
 Hayes, Quentin O., O86236.
 Klentz, John E., O86363.
 Logan, Fred G., O88421.
 Logan, John D., O89091.
 Lyon, Wilson L., O88802.
 Martin, William A., O88813.
 McCloy, Charles H., Sr., O88818.
 Moorfield, Claude E., Jr., O84232.
 Moss, Ira G., O89113.
 Nagata, William M., O88856.
 Nybro, Richard, O88864.
 Pasco, John C., O84245.
 Raynis, Edgar A., O84252.
 Salemm, Robert A., O86714.
 Stanford, James A., O88956.
 Swager, Robert G., O88963.

Tate, David F., O88969.
Tibbetts, Alan C., O88976.
Wright, Wendell T., O89017.
Young, Willis F., O89169.

To be captains, Women's Army Corps

Austin, Audrey H., L495.
Collins, Joyce L., L539.
Dotts, Eloise M., L469.
Lee, Laurie A., L565.
Marks, Mary F. G., L497.
Purcell, Mary M., L498.
Slawson, Elizabeth F., L476.
Smith, Ann B., L474.
Theodoroff, Mary J., L501.
White, Jocelyn A., L491.
Williams, Mary R., L515.
Wolcott, Jeanne M., L503.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law:

To be first lieutenants

Kilpatrick, John C., Jr., O75652.
Krapf, Albert H., 2d, O75660.
Olsen, Thomas A., O75739.
Renkin, Herbert L., O76545.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be majors

Lyle Albert Duffield, O2034816.
Anthony Richard Mattos, O1316307.

To be captains

Thomas Doherty Byrne, O1935751.
John Durant Chastain, O2002625.
Jimmie Arnold Chezem, O1897408.
Fred Vincent Cole, O1937752.
Robert Edward Cormier, O4014730.
Warren Crawford Davis, O1888627.
John Michele DeMaria, O2200410.
Dale Eugene Dobson, O1883583.
Peter Paul Gerhards, O4007119.
Gilbert Jay John, O1888992.
Richard Anacletus Kupau, O4005908.
Charles William Norton, Jr., O2028514.
Frank Louis Russo, O1933329.
William Samuel Schroeder, O2283031.
Thomas Cousar Stanton, O1973526.
John Wesley Stillwell, O1929120.
Edwin Alfred Stovall, O2204057.
William Francis Vernau, O4005387.
Bernard DeWayne Wheeler, O2203702.

To be first lieutenants

Benjamin John Basil, O4015443.
David Albert Bear, O4030878.
Marc Herman Epstein, O4028774.
Mack Lee Gibson, Jr., O4045046.
James Neil McDougald, O4025576.
Robert Warren Otto, O5502035.
John Thomas Patterson, O4047170.
James Randall Pullin, O4061341.
Calvin Swartz, O4063016.
Marcus Lesly Weatherall, O4025839.
James Alfred Windsor, O4083543.

To be second lieutenants

Lawrence Abramson, O5210056.
William James Anderson, O5202117.
David Henry Andre, O5203830.
Edward Michael Bahniuk, O5506370.
Robert Thomas Basha, O5303525.
J. D. Benson, O5306492.
Alfred Herman Beyer, O4064963.
Danon Lester Brantley, O5303343.
Thomas Richard Braun, O5006750.
Robert Porter Brokaw, Jr., O5306538.
John Marshall Broome, O5208356.
Charles Henry Cagle, O5403668.
Ralph Wilson Case, Jr., O5700326.
James Calvin Caston, O5401684.
John Edward Ciccarelli, O2290167.
Theodore Alexander Couloumbis, O5405398.
Norman Matthew Descoteaux, O5002906.

James Joseph Dorsey, O5508714.
Arthur Randolph Ericksen, O5305777.
John Francis Fallon, Jr., O5000924.
George Russell Goetzke, O5400740.
Carl Theodor Goldenberg, III, O5403129.
Duane Irvin Graham, O5510221.
Ray Alexander Gravett, O5204788.
Frank Dale Green, Jr., O5409033.
Angelo Guttadauro, O5704698.
Paul Gordon Heald, O5702970.
Calvin Still Hembree, O5411095.
James David Holden, O4053049.
Tommy Gene Hollis, O5305906.
Raymond Henry Hoist, O5002629.
James Royce Hopkins, O5403445.
William Arthur Keefe, IV, O5205802.
Stephen Aloysius Krupa, Jr., O5206514.
Eugene Bowman Leedy, RA15605277.
Barry Lee Manley, O5005213.
Charles Harvey McKinnis, O5510394.
Robert Daniel O'Bryan, O5405415.
Benjamin Louis Parsley, O5308131.
Don Phillips, O5702502.
Bruce Wayne Pound, O5304374.
Wilson Reitz, Jr., O5204207.
Joseph Samuel Reneau, O5402582.
Celeste Thomas Richardson, O5506269.
William Howard Roche, Jr., O5303825.
Frederick Thomas Rogers, O5205373.
Jean Andre Sauvageot, O5304511.
Lawrence Anthony Singer, O5205315.
Tom Collins Spears, O5402225.
Benjamin Lee Swinson, O5304387.
Richard Allen Thompson, O5701021.
William Joseph Weber, O5205130.
Paul Raymond Wineman, Jr., O5702814.
Richard Elliott Workes, O5203138.
Dean Wesley Wright, O5507720.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3291, 3292, and 3294:

To be majors, Medical Corps

James Roger Glessner, Jr.
William Masatoshi Sugiyama, O4050930.

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Anne Story Deming, N805536.
Lorene Faye Loftin, N901469.
Helen Mary McBride, N761873.
Sally Madge Stallard, N805401.

To be captains, Chaplains

David Lee Funk, O1892230.
Charles Frederick Kriete, O2283728.
Ralph Kurt Willers, O4039831.

To be captains, Dental Corps

James Patrick Baldwin, O5301083.
Carmine Anthony Caponigro, O4015046.
Lee Getter, O5003589.
Robert Wayne Kamphuis, O5500435.
Samuel McMillin Locke, Jr., O5202563.
John Walter Love, O5500468.
Roger Vincent Majerus, O5500378.
Elbert Allen Warren, O2275911.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Robert Cromwell Bastian, Jr., O2284561.
James Joseph Bingham, O4068042.
Hollis Eugene Bivens, O996855.
Paul Edward Brenk, O2284773.
John Buist Chester, Jr., O2288923.
Walter Thomas Coon, O2284423.
Donald William Cox, O2286653.
Richard Donald Cunningham, O2284775.
Dermot Joseph Demis, O2288920.
William Dwight Deupree, O1929620.
Olin Carl Dobbis, Jr., O5306721.
William Frank Dossman, O2283965.
Forrest Dorsey Garretson, Jr., O4000788.
Robert Francis Haden, O4001639.
Benjamin Lee Harper, O4073512.
James Edward Hertzog, O5304511.
LeRoy Roman Hieger, O2285401.
James Francis Hora, O2283738.
Egon Victor Johnson, O2284914.
William Fremont Kinn, O2283892.

John Stephen Kolina, O2283969.
James Davies Krueger, O2284806.
Sonley Robert LeMay, Jr., O2285237.
Robert James Marsh, O5204162.
Rafael Enrique Mendoza, O5703073.
Donald Edward Mitchell, O2298927.
Everett Cole Mosley, O2284050.
Franklin Craig Moten, O1942298.
Joseph Louis Murad, O5301339.
Robert Calvin Newell, O2102775.
William Patton Phillips, O1942229.
Charles Thomas Riley, Jr., O2288928.
Erich Daniel Ryll, O2284551.
Edgar Benton Smith, O2284643.
Martin Adelbert Spellman, O5703007.
Charles Douglas Spencer, O5204132.
Fred Wesley Thomas, O2284245.
Harlan Theodore Thoreson, O5701438.
Russel Walter Van Norman, O1942191.
Waldo Raymond Varberg, O2285027.
Clarence McCurdy Virtue, Jr., O2282663.
Charles Robert Webb, Jr., O2283697.
Paul Hyman Wengrovitz, O5003859.
Alton Enoch Wiebe, O5701441.
Karl Adams Zener, O2288917.

To be captain, Medical Service Corps

Marion Philip Johnson, O1888346.

To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Dorothy Ann Simon, N805727.

To be first lieutenants, Dental Corps

Leon Dale Fiedler, O2295612.
Thomas Eugene Miller, O2297812.

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Leonard George Crowley, O2296967.
Lawrence Lippe, O4065181.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Allin, John Otteson, O5202510.
Bogumill, George Pierce, O5500320.
Campbell, John Blake, O2298006.
Casale, Louis Anthony, O2295476.
Cirksena, William John, O2295407.
Colliton, Patrick Allen, O2297901.
Cressman, Marvin Richard, O5203294.
Daughtridge, Clay Cuthrell, Jr., O2297912.
DelVecchio, Pasquale Anthony.
Dillon, Donald Edward, O2295784.
Egan, James Francis.
Ewell, Robert Healy, O2297982.
Fahs, Gerald Richard, O2295466.
Fishback, Malcolm Edward, O2297958.
Glass, Sheldon David.
Haas, John Michael, O2297947.
Haddad, Jean Gabriel Khouri, O4019935.
Hamre, Peter Jay, O2291892.
Heydorn, William Howard.
Holloman, Kenneth Raymond, O4035511.
Isom, Lawrence Edward, O2295245.
Jewett, Darrell Charles, O2297865.
Lamazor, Eugene Arnold, O2297949.
Ledford, Frank Finley, Jr., O2295759.
Mani, Richard Louis, O2297967.
Mazze, Richard Irwin, O5003372.
Nielsen, Peter LaMont, O2297918.
Park, Richard, O2295385.
Pinski, James Bernard, O2297969.
Raymond, James Robert, O2297964.
Rogers, Lee Frank, O2297976.
Rossing, William Osmund, O2297948.
Schamadani, James Louis, O2295356.
Schencker, Bernard, O2297963.
Skowronski, John Robert.
Stagnone, James Joseph, O2297993.
Stuckey, Marvin Earl, O5407674.
Wachtel, Herbert Leonard, O2295632.
Williams, Melvin Clayton, O5203756.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Phillips, Finos James, O2269132.
Yim, Herbert Kamakakaopua, O4058420.

To be first lieutenants, Veterinary Corps

Boucher, John Holly, O2298257.
Spertzel, Richard Oscar, O2298183.
Thomas, Paul Oliver, O2295316.

To be second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Rairden, Carol Anne, N5407148.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Carper, Robert Ray, O1922615.
Fountain, Donald Bruce, O4084464.
Oswald, Gilbert Harvey, O5701019.
Piercy, John Philip, O2269735.
Webb, Byron Douglas, Jr., O5505327.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Arthur Robert Fournier
Edward Stanley Krakowski
Richard Edward Melers
George Keck Powell
Jerome Charles Reich
Kenneth Robert Welch

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Dennis Wayne Adams
Ronald Lowell Abner
Alvin James Albright
Troy Gerard Arnold, Jr.
Leon Robert Arnoldi
William Farrar Balfanz
Roger Lee Bartelt
John Kent Bosking
John Theodore Bowden, Jr.
Kenneth Alvin Brewer
Robert William Browning
Terence Dunford Buck
Lynn Irvin Caraway
Donald Edwin Carlile
Samuel Anthony Carollo, Jr.
Richard Joseph Celichowski
Daniel Robert Clark
Gary Leon Comfort
Clyde Lee Cook, Jr.
Douglas Ray Cresswell
Gerald Franklin Croll
Hector Cruz
Dean Eckwall Danielson
Edwin Bernard Dean
Harold Frederick DeBolt
Milton Hewen Diehl
Louis Dean Easterday
Cecll Wilmont Elder
Larry Lester Fairman
John Joseph Fanning III
Nicholas James Fergadis
Clinton Andrew Fields
Robert Slade Fiero
Courtney Ronald Fritts
James Edward Fritz
Walter John Gabrysiak
Robert Webb Gannett
Jose Garcia
Miguel Angel Garcia
John Lawrence Geisinger
Taft Rosco Gilliam
Richard Joseph Girouard
William Anthony Gissler
James Morgan Goodrich
Eldon Henry Graham
Joe Hiram Griggs
James Frederick Hayes
Lloyd Jean Hays
Larry Charles Heaton
Anthony Louis Hittner
Gerhardt Will Hodel
Richard Lee Hooverson
Jerry Alonza Hubbard
John David Hutcheson
Darrel Duane Jacobs
Edward Mark Jansen
James Buford Johnson
Thomas Willems Johnson
John Joseph Kane
John Richard Kane
Claude Hideaki Kanemori
Jack Ralph Keene

Thomas John Kiernan
Lloyd Wayne Kleinstiver
Gene Raymond Kobza
Thomas Owen Kuypers
Roger Joseph Labat
William Gregory Lacey
William Andrew Lang
Joseph Stanley LeGath
Martin Richard Lewis, Jr.
Andres Lopez
John Patrick Mackin, Jr.
Alan Doyle Mayberry
Walter Patrick McCann
Philip Remington McDonald
Irby Neill McInnis, Jr.
James Alvin Minyard
Charles Howard Morgan
Michael John Morin
Donald Stephen Mostek
Robert Stephen Nawalaniec
John William Nichols
Richard Joseph Ozga
Joseph Wesley Parent
Thomas Carl Rankin, Jr.
Dennis Allen Repp
Charles Monte Richard
Avrom A. Rosen.
Duvall Thomas Royster, Jr.
Thomas Frederick Ryan
David Clifford Saalfrank
Donald Ivan Seathoff
John Preston Sanders
Allen Dale Schlegelmilch
Leland Roy Schroeder
Stephen Joseph Snyder
Ralph Louis Sorensen
Robert LaVerne Spangler
Charles Anthony Stulga
David John Sutton
Thomas George Swaney
James Albert Titmas
Grade Frank Tittle, Jr.
Roy Glenn Vawter
Randolph William Von Till, Jr.
Clifford Coale Walker
William Francis Ward
Robert Emmett Welmer
Robert Stephen Wilhelm
Lonnie Buford Williams, Jr.
John Harvey Wilson
James Willard Wolff
Lawrence Edward Wolmering
Michael Joseph Wunder

The following-named cadets, graduating class of 1960, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288, subject to physical examination required by law:

Wilsie Horton Adams, Jr.
John Howard Alban, Jr.
Donald Kenneth Allen
Lee Allen
Robert Harold Ammerman, Jr.
Robert Paul Anderson
Raymond Sherwood Andrews, Jr.
Joseph Valentine Arnold
Hughes Lanier Ash, Jr.
William Nathan Bailey, Jr.
Anthony David Baker
Charles Roy Baker
Edward Russell Baldwin, Jr.
Thaddeus Joseph Bara, Jr.
George Peter Bare
Ercole Michael Barone
Allyn Jay Barr
Donald Harvey Barrell
Raymond Reed Barrows, Jr.
David Woodfin Bauer
Leslie Edward Beavers
Charles Gene Belan
Edward Allen Bellis, 3d
Ronald Alan Beltz
Thomas Reed Bennett
Joel Elias Bernstein
John Anderson Berry III
John Randolph Bertl
Ferdinand Clarence Bidgood
Robert Nelson Bierly, Jr.

Judson Long Bireley
Anthony Harris Blackstone
Phillip Lyle Blake
John Richard Blanton, Jr.
William Thomas Blitch
Arthur Le Roy Bloch
Joseph John Bobula
Frank Joseph Bochnowski
James Arthur Booker, Jr.
Richard Klemm Boyd, Jr.
Edward James Brady
Ambrose William Brennan
Peter Brindley
Eugene Munson Brisach
Jay Scott Brown
Harold Andrew Brownfield, Jr.
Thomas Lee Bullock
Bertram Arnold Bunting
John Richard Burden
Robert William Burnell
Robert Edward Burns
David Francis Byrnes
Joseph Grady Caldwell
Ora Oscar Caldwell
Francis Joseph Calverase
Harry Charles Calvin
Dan Harold Campbell
Richard Joseph Campbell
Raymond Gordon Canant
Joe Middleton Cannon
Julian Thomas Caraballo
Arthur Thomas Carey
Clayton Henry Carmean, Jr.
Richard Allan Carnaghi
William Stanley Carpenter, Jr.
Hector Andres Carron
Kevin Reilly Carter
Martin William Cary, Jr.
John Lloyd Casey
Robert Jones Castleman, Jr.
Richard Webb Cato
Paul George Cerjan
Brion Victor Chabot
William Frederick Chamberlain, Jr.
Alan Douglas Champ
Clark Porter Chandler 2d
Don Clark Chapman
Gerald Chapman, Jr.
Phillip Edward Chappell
William Clark Chase, Jr.
Vincent Robert Chitren
Robert Francis Clancy
Claude Leaman Clark
Wayne Clay
Gregory Charles Clement, Jr.
Lawrence Raymond Coffey, Jr.
Charles Driscoll Collins 3d
John Guy Coombs
Milton Eustis Cooper, Jr.
Alonzo Coose, Jr.
Joseph Robert Cote
Stillman Doane Covell, Jr.
Richard Lafayette Cox, Jr.
William Edwin Creighton
Frank Nevin Cremer
Phillip Miles Croel
George Trent Crosby
Edward Miller Crowley
Edward Waldren Crum
John Clayton Crump
Ross Herman Cullins
William Warren Danforth
Richard Arthur Daniel
Theodore Stephens Danielsen
Dean Harvey Darling
Merlin Duane Darling
Richard Samuel Daum
Robert Batson Davidson, Jr.
Joal LeRoy Davis
William Fred Dawdy
John David DelPonti
John Charles DePew
John Lesesne DeWitt 3d
Edwin Augustus Deagle, Jr.
Arthur Joe Dean, Jr.
Charles Casimer Decko, Jr.
John Roe Denton, Jr.
Ronald Frederick Desgroseillers
Denis Crowley Dice
Jack Woodward Dice
Daniel James Donahue

Thomas Joseph Donahue
 Ira Dorsey
 James Anthony Douglass
 John Thomas Downey
 Edmond Howard Drake
 Harold Newton Dreibelbis, Jr.
 Henry Frederick Drewfs, Jr.
 William Orville Drollinger
 Wallace Hampton Duncan
 Albert John Dunlap
 Lyman Chandler Duryea, Jr.
 Charles Maurice Dwyre
 Robert Douw Eckert
 Michael Ralph Eckmann
 Rand Ederstein
 Jack Evans Elder
 Clarence Earl Endy, Jr.
 Gerald George Epley, Jr.
 Robert Francisco Estes, Jr.
 Earl Wheelbert Eubanks
 Herman Thomas Eubanks, Jr.
 Benjamin Franklin Evans 3d
 Otto George Everbach
 Thomas Franklin Eynon 3d
 Henry Frederick Faery, Jr.
 James Berkley Fairchild
 Robert Scobie Fairweather, Jr.
 John Peter Fanning
 Francis William Farrell, Jr.
 William Peter Fay
 Charles Benjamin Fegan
 Joseph George Felber, Jr.
 Roland Dwight Fenton
 Michael Lambert Ferguson
 James Paul Fero
 Michael Finlay Field
 George Alexander Finley, Jr.
 Frank Delaney Finn
 Eugene Patrick Flannery
 Walker Hancock Flint
 William Eugene Florence
 Jere King Forbus
 Joseph Edgar Fortier 3d
 Nathaniel Sill Fox
 Robert Foye, Jr.
 Bartley William Furey
 John Charles Fyfe
 Ross Andrew Gagliano
 Charles Leonard Gallo
 George Keith Garner
 Edward Reeves Garton, Jr.
 James George Garvey
 Richard Holt Gates
 John Franklin Geiger
 Abraham Lincoln German, Jr.
 John Hale Getgood
 George Nunzio Giacompe
 John Stephen Gibbs
 Arthur Martin Giese
 Chris George Gigicos
 Terrance Mathew Gill
 Richard Hyde Gillespie
 Wayne Gordon Gillespie
 Michael William Gilmartin
 James Stewart Godwin
 Walter Rexford Good
 Vincent Gregory Grande, Jr.
 Richard McDonald Greene
 Fletcher Hughes Griffiths, Jr.
 Eugene Donald Griffith, Jr.
 Fenton Harris Griffith
 John Francis Guila
 Robert Thomas Gerald Hackett
 Craig Allan Hagan
 Frederick Benjamin Hall 3d
 Fred Nicholas Halley
 Ronald Wayne Halsall
 Edward John Handler 3d
 William Geron Hanne
 Elmer Raymond Hapeman
 Howard Theodore Harcke, Jr.
 William Jan Hardenburg
 William Ray Harnagel
 Walter Dinsmore Hastings, Jr.
 Michael Joseph Hatcher
 Thomas James Haycraft
 Richard Wyman Healy, Jr.
 George Michael Heckman
 Richard William Helbock
 Dean A. Herman, Jr.
 Richard James Hervert

John Powell Hesford
 Stanford Wayne Hickman
 Manuel Angel Hidalgo, Jr.
 Kenneth Ray Hill
 John Arthur Hixson
 John Gunnar Hoas
 David Loyal Hodge
 John David Hogarth
 Patrick Joseph Holland
 Richard Joseph Holleman
 James Allison Hopper
 William Joseph Hourihan, Jr.
 John Clinton House
 Darrell Gwynn Houston
 Eugene Adair Howell
 John Bolling Hubard
 Donald Albert Hubbard
 Johnny Ray Hubbard
 Thomas Henry Huber
 Jack Phelan Hug
 Jack Thomas Humes
 James Ellegood Humphreys, Jr.
 Joseph William Hutchison
 John William Hynd
 Richard Alan Jaeckel
 James Herbert Jansen
 Joseph Alexander Jascewsky, Jr.
 Michael Andrew Jezior
 Grafton Jhung
 Gerald Ramsey Jilbert
 Alan Edward Johnson
 Fredrick Arthur Johnson
 James Houston Johnson
 Robert Campbell Johnson
 Robert Norman Johnson
 William LeRoy Johnson
 Homer William Jones, Jr.
 Arthur Edward Judson
 George Frederick Kaiser
 James Richard Kane
 John Patrick Kane
 John Kelly Keane, Jr.
 Albert Clark Keating
 Samuel Philbrick Kelley, Jr.
 Kenneth Lloyd King
 Lyell Francis King
 Kenneth Reese Kirchner
 Robert Ernest Klein
 Larry Victor Kling
 James William Klosek
 Thomas Alfred Koentop
 Thomas Ellis Kopp
 Darryle Leslie Kouns
 Darryl Snyder Krape
 Norman Julius Kuklinski
 Harold Lee Ladehoff
 Peter Frederick Lagasse
 Michael Stuart Lane
 Leslie Gene Langseth
 Edward John Laurance
 John Allan Le Febvre
 Henry Lee
 Robert Leland Leech
 Glenn Harris Lehrer
 John Michael Lenti
 Irving Abram Lerch
 Victor Theodore Letonoff
 Jerome Xavier Lewis, 2d
 James Buchanan Lincoln
 Gordon Stuart Livingston
 Ned Natale Loscuito, Jr.
 Mark Perrin Lowrey
 Mark Lowry II
 Joseph Carter Lucas
 Kenneth Richard Ludovici
 Harold Herzl Lusky
 Charles Gordon Luton
 Frederick James Lynn
 David J. Mac Aulay
 Peter Maclachlan
 Thomas Pearson Maginnis
 William Henry Maloney
 Charles R. Mandelbaum
 Paul William Mandry
 Robert Donald Marcinkowski
 Spencer Dee Marcy
 Herman Samuel Marmon
 Williams Swift Martin, Jr.
 John Roger Martz
 Leslie Paul Mason, Jr.
 James Kenneth McCollum

George Joseph McElroy
 William Neal McFaul, 3d
 Philip Vincent McGance
 Richard Nash McInerney
 John Joseph McKinney
 Eugene Joseph McLaughlin
 George Hornsby McManus
 William Tripp McNamara
 George Patrick McQuillen
 Jennings Herbert Mease
 William Alexander Meder
 Robert John Menzner
 Robert Kimball Mercado
 Michael Denis Mierau
 Paul Lindsay Miles, Jr.
 Carl Dennis Miller
 Dyson Ramsey Conklin Miller
 John Zollinger Miller, Jr.
 Robert Howard Mills
 Robert Samuel Miser, Jr.
 John Paul Misura
 Robert Everard Montgomery, Jr.
 Michael Joseph Mooney
 Reynold Morin
 Robert Gordon Morrison
 Hartman Baxter Mowery, Jr.
 William Francis Murphy
 Robert Miller Myers
 William Nicholas Myers, Jr.
 Joseph Edward Naftzinger
 Charles Richard Neely
 Charles Richard Nelson
 Bruce Stanley Nevins
 John Ulay Nix
 Charles Stedmen Nobles
 Thomas Elbert Noel III
 James Timothy O'Connell, Jr.
 Roy John O'Connor, Jr.
 Joseph Daniels O'Keefe
 Daniel Louis O'Leary
 Thomas Kelly O'Malley
 James Bryan Oerding
 Danford Milton Orr
 Robert Eugene Oswandel
 Charles Paddock Otstott
 Bobby Lee Owens
 Elliot Vail Parker, Jr.
 Frank Almond Partlow, Jr.
 James Hildred Pearl, 2d
 Jack Anthony Pellicci
 Randall Ambrose Perkins, Jr.
 Henry Allen Phillips
 Larry William Pitts
 Robert Charles Platt, Jr.
 Frederick Boyd Plummer, Jr.
 Michael Thomas Plummer
 Elwyn Donald Post, Jr.
 James Allan Powers
 Michael Otto Preletz
 Donald William Prosser
 Richard Kevin Queeney
 James Rose Ramos
 William Montgomery Raymond
 John Lawrence Reber
 Eugene Price Reese, Jr.
 John Calvin Reid
 Ernest Authur Remus
 Frederick Colton Rice
 Terrence LaVerne Rich
 Alfred Kenneth Richeson
 William Ludlow Ritchie 2d
 Gerard Joseph Rivell
 Chandler Prather Robbins III
 Paul Anthony Roberts
 Tom Adams Robinson
 William Ward Robocker
 Melvin Wilbur Rollins, Jr.
 James Nicholas Rowe
 Robert Sidney Rudesill
 William Peter Ruedel
 Max Elden Rumbaugh, Jr.
 James Delano Ruppert
 William Andrew Rux 2d
 Michael Thomas Ryan
 Roger McKelvey Ryan
 Larry Wilson Sapper
 William Ward Sartoris
 Paul Joseph Savio
 Grant Arthur Schaefer
 Thomas Francis Schatzman, Jr.
 Robert John Schlemann

Leroy Allen Schmidt
 Charles Thomas Schmitt
 John Jarrett Schneider
 Richard Tilford Schofield, Jr.
 Charles Rupert Schrankel
 Frederick Udo Schroeder
 James Frederick Schwoob
 Stephen Harlan Scott
 William Irvine Scudder
 Jonathan Walter Searles
 Richard Stout Seaward
 John Bradley Seely
 William Thaddeus Sexton, Jr.
 Roger Graham Seymour
 John Frederick Shelby
 John Pearson Sherden 3d
 Daniel Wayne Shimek
 Alan Thomas Shost
 Richard Phillip Shuey
 William Joe Skinner
 Daniel Arthur Smith
 Harold Barroner Smith
 Berton Everett Spivy III
 Joseph William Squire
 George Robert Stanley, Jr.
 James Dane Starling
 John Scott Steele
 Joseph Michael Stehling, Jr.
 David Howard Stem
 Joseph Warren Stillwell 3d
 Donald Frederick Straetz
 Edward Strasbourger
 Charles Ellis Sturgeon
 Joel Edward Sugdinis
 Don Allen Summers
 Adolph Sutton, Jr.
 Richard Otto Sutton, Jr.
 Paul Charles Swain
 Paul Stevens Symonds
 William Frederick Tamplin, Jr.
 John Norman Taylor
 Thomas Happer Taylor
 Frederick Garside Terry
 Francis James Thompson
 Olin Rosco Thompson, Jr.
 Thomas Bullene Throckmorton
 James Robert Tichenor, 3d
 Charles Martin Titus
 Robert Gerald Totten
 Walter Cornelius Tousey
 William Smith Tozer
 Ronald Frank Trauner
 Frederick Richard Trickett
 Philip Anthony Triplician
 Robert Hagerman Tripp
 Robert Anthony Trodella
 Thomas Evangelista Valente, Jr.
 Charles Martin Valliant
 Thomas Peter Van Riper
 William Thomas Veal, Jr.
 William Austin Venell
 Milledge Euel Wade, Jr.
 Edward John Walczak
 Stephen Preston Waldrop
 Philip Augustus Walker, Jr.
 Richard Emil Walter
 Russell Ashton Waters
 Charlie Clarke Watkins
 Henry Charles Watson, 3d
 John Eugene Weiler, Jr.
 David Brian Wentworth
 Harry Noel White
 James McRae White
 Floyd Donald Whitehead
 Thomas Nelsen Whitmore
 Joseph Patrick Wiley
 Noble James Wiley III
 John Solomon Wilkes III
 David Gordon Wilkie
 John Henry Willauer
 Larry Morgan Williams
 William Howard Willoughby, Jr.
 Richard Tyler Willson, Jr.
 Daniel Hunter Wilson
 Gene Raymond Wilson
 Walter King Wilson III
 Humphrey Francis Windsor
 Gerald Francis Winters
 Jerry Wayne Witherspoon
 Anthony Benson Wood

Charles Herbert Wood, Jr.
 John Weller Wood, Jr.
 George Edmund Wrockloff III
 William Emer Yeager
 John Paul Yeagley
 James Joseph York

The following-named midshipmen, graduating class of 1960, U.S. Naval Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 541, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288, subject to physical examination required by law:

Isaac Francis Bonifay, Jr.
 Arnold Richard DuPont
 John Walden Durham
 Jack Hamilton Ferguson
 John Joseph Garrity, Jr.
 Forrest Virgil Graves
 James Clarence Householder
 John Theodore Kazenski
 David Livingston Lowry
 John Anthony Martin
 Douglas Sherman Morgan
 Henry William Papa
 Neal Gordon Parker
 Robert Graham Patterson
 John Robert Presley
 Michael Louis Sheppeck, Jr.
 James Joseph Ten Brook

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Everett L. Hall, Hazen, Ark., in place of L. A. Tyson, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Fridolph E. Nelson, Keyes, Calif., in place of L. M. Hinson, retired.
 Noriyuki Tashima, Livingston, Calif., in place of John Healy, deceased.
 Dorothy E. Finn, Sausalito, Calif., in place of T. M. Bradley, retired.
 Harold D. Dean, West Covina, Calif. Office established September 6, 1958.

COLORADO

Wesley H. Amrine, Cortez, Colo., in place of W. W. Winegar, resigned.
 Leslie M. Cogswell, Pierce, Colo., in place of E. F. Hultt, retired.
 Ertis D. Shelton, Pritchett, Colo., in place of J. W. Stuart, retired.

FLORIDA

Edythe C. Smith, Canal Point, Fla., in place of Osceola Upthegrove, resigned.
 James E. Combs, Glen Saint Mary, Fla., in place of J. E. Franklin, retired.

GEORGIA

Charles R. Sprayberry, Trion, Ga., in place of C. S. Bell, deceased.

IDAHO

Clarence Larson, Hayden Lake, Idaho, in place of M. D. Becker, retired.
 George L. Crapo, Idaho Falls, Idaho, in place of Parley Rigby, retired.

ILLINOIS

Violet L. Pittman, Camp Point, Ill., in place of W. H. Bruns, retired.
 Raymond F. Cromwell, Kenney, Ill., in place of Enid Trowbridge, retired.
 Tom H. Mason, Marietta, Ill., in place of J. A. McCance, retired.
 Elmer A. Lawson, Jr., Rome, Ill., in place of E. A. Lawson, retired.

INDIANA

Lester S. Weir, Lagrange, Ind., in place of H. G. Groat, retired.
 Herbert A. Hedges, Universal, Ind., in place of M. E. Lewis, retired.

IOWA

Lloyd R. Peterson, Casey, Iowa, in place of P. G. Thompson, retired.

Theodore W. Swensen, Decorah, Iowa, in place of O. A. Jaeger, retired.
 Ralph B. Speers, Eldora, Iowa, in place of J. R. Bahne, retired.
 Daniel H. Maxwell, Spencer, Iowa, in place of C. A. Tripp, retired.

KANSAS

Margaret L. Hejtmanek, Delia, Kans., in place of M. A. Lane, retired.
 Jack Morrison, Jr., Great Bend, Kans., in place of J. L. Brown, retired.

KENTUCKY

Ben H. Dyer, Albany, Ky., in place of W. H. Vitatoe, retired.
 Kermit L. Tussey, Cynthiana, Ky., in place of J. M. Magee, retired.
 Georgia H. Wilkerson, Dixon, Ky., in place of M. W. Blackwell, retired.
 Ira J. Westerman, Muldraugh, Ky., in place of M. B. Withers, retired.
 James G. Dismuke, Salvisa, Ky., in place of N. M. Ramsdell, retired.
 Mary F. Hill, Stone, Ky., in place of J. S. May, retired.
 Arnold D. Sprague, Jr., Sturgis, Ky., in place of L. D. Rose, retired.
 Francis E. Ryan, Verona, Ky., in place of Mayro Hayden, resigned.

LOUISIANA

John A. Schuchs, St. Joseph, La., in place of B. K. Schuchs, retired.
 Herthel S. Devall, Springfield, La., in place of G. A. Rownd, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Vivian I. Tancrell, North Uxbridge, Mass., in place of W. J. Tancrell, retired.
 Arthur F. King, Sharon, Mass., in place of J. J. Hayes, resigned.
 Paul P. Skorput, West Stockbridge, Mass., in place of J. J. Troy, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Roger A. Camfield, Gobles, Mich., in place of L. A. Wauchek, resigned.
 Vernon L. Erskine, Moran, Mich., in place of I. J. Gille, retired.
 Charles H. Hill, Ontonagon, Mich., in place of J. L. Dobbek, retired.
 William R. Froelich, Rogers City, Mich., in place of I. D. Larke, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Laverne W. Martin, Gibbon, Minn., in place of H. G. Carlson, deceased.
 Robert F. Entzlon, Knife River, Minn., in place of Grace Congdon, deceased.
 Orville H. Eidem, Spring Park, Minn., in place of Marguerite Linquish, retired.

MISSOURI

Robert H. Hunter, East Prairie, Mo., in place of W. W. Bledsoe, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Russell N. Holm, Derry, N.H., in place of C. D. Floyd, deceased.

NEW YORK

John D. Wolcott, Alexander, N.Y., in place of E. R. Harrington, retired.
 Millard H. Bury, Callicoon Center, N.Y., in place of S. W. Schuster, Jr., deceased.
 Nelle P. Johnson, Chichester, N.Y., in place of Helen Bennett, retired.
 James R. Fuller, Fleischmanns, N.Y., in place of J. F. Kelly, retired.
 Carl J. Barry, Kent, N.Y., in place of R. K. Fishbaugh, deceased.
 Francis P. Secor, Otego, N.Y., in place of R. A. Southard, declined.
 Dominic V. Panichi, Wynantskill, N.Y., in place of I. R. Puffer, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

James D. Cobb, Lumber Bridge, N.C., in place of D. G. Clifton, declined.

NORTH DAKOTA

Raymond F. Pfeifer, Buffalo, N. Dak., in place of J. U. Pavlik, deceased.

Leland L. Ribb, Donnybrook, N. Dak., in place of C. C. King, transferred.

OHIO

Arthur F. Rizzi, Lansing, Ohio, in place of L. A. Franco, resigned.

Ruth C. Menker, Maria Stein, Ohio, in place of U. B. Menker, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

Lilly J. Westfall, Carney, Okla., in place of J. O. Deer, deceased.

Charles F. Rhoton, Jr., Keyes, Okla., in place of O. L. Badgley, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Edward L. Thomas, Drifton, Pa., in place of N. E. Breslin, retired.

Paul R. Moore, Enon Valley, Pa., in place of P. N. Lindner, resigned.

Henry L. Haines, Maytown, Pa., in place of M. E. Culp, retired.

Preston L. Allison, Shrewsbury, Pa., in place of Marea Stover, retired.

Stewart C. McCullough, Wattsburg, Pa., in place of H. E. Burnham, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

William G. Stivers, Dimock, S. Dak., in place of C. A. Johnson, retired.

Eldon E. Case, Pine Ridge, S. Dak., in place of H. J. Hagel, transferred.

TENNESSEE

M. Greer Raulston, Monteagle, Tenn., in place of C. P. Fults, retired.

Thurman L. Jackson, St. Joseph, Tenn., in place of G. M. Bryan, retired.

TEXAS

Wilmoth A. Ingalls, Winnie, Tex., in place of Ethel Gill, retired.

UTAH

Max G. Johnson, Midway, Utah, in place of N. A. Burgener, retired.

VERMONT

Alton A. Ellis, West Pawlet, Vt., in place of P. E. Kehoe, retired.

VIRGINIA

William E. Humphreys, Clarksville, Va., in place of A. B. Crowder, retired.

William B. Anderson, Onley, Va., in place of W. O. Brittingham, resigned.

George A. Carpenter, Woodberry Forest, Va., in place of W. E. Ewers, deceased.

WASHINGTON

Genevieve F. Tapscott, Longmire, Wash., in place of H. C. Colvin, resigned.

WISCONSIN

George W. Smith, Franksville, Wis., in place of W. J. Perlberg, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Halley Brooks Oliver, First Congregational Church, Owosso, Mich., offered the following prayer:

Our gracious Heavenly Father, we pause before Thee to seek the blessing of Thy guidance for the work of this day.

May, O Lord, those prayers made by Thy churches and people, for this Nation and these Thy servants, prepare hearts and minds for the working of Thy holy spirit.

We so often pray for Thy wisdom, Thy spirit, Thy love; yet it is too high, we cannot attain unto it. Make us, therefore, aware that we have wisdom from Thee: help us to use it; that we have

felt Thy spirit: grant that we be receptive to it.

We know the conditions of Thy love and that it casteth out fear; may mercy and justice be shown.

Give these Thy servants the understanding that the Nation honors them and looks to their work. May what is done be pleasing in Thy sight. We pray in the name of the Master. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 10234) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may sit during the session of the House this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEES ON LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT, AND HEALTH AND SAFETY

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight and the Subcommittee on Health and Safety be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

ARE WE FAILING IN THE FAR EAST?

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I gave facts exposing the farce of so-called democratic free elections on Formosa under Nationalist China and related them to the serious situation in South Korea caused by similar hypocrisy and injustice.

Now we have word about so-called favorable election results in Laos. But we hear little about the use of the army

and other measures to secure such results. I know enough of the facts, and have forewarned about them previously, to report that instead of being able to cite a case of a democratic free election, we will hear claims that these elections were rigged.

How long can the prestige of Western democracy and freedom be sustained in the Far East if there is so little of it or even honesty in so many places where we exert an influence?

I have called for a reappraisal of our activities in that area. I have said that our Foreign Affairs Committee and particularly our Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific should get the facts independently. We dare not let things drift; we cannot afford to participate in a "whitewash" or in sweeping dirt under the rug.

Several Members of Congress had doubts relative to the appointment of J. Graham Parsons as Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs. His appointment was a mistake and he should be replaced. The United States and all nations associated with us in the quest for peace, freedom, and justice dare not risk further failures in principle or direction of purpose.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] be granted leave of absence for 5 days due to business in his congressional district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS ACT OF 1960

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, it is of primary public interest that campaign expenses of candidates for national, State and local offices shall be met by large numbers of modest contributions rather than chiefly from a relatively few large contributions.

The situation has become so serious at national levels that there has been talk of making appropriations from public funds available to the major political parties.

The bill I have just introduced is intended to meet the situation by encouraging large numbers of modest contributions to political committees, including independent committees organized to promote a candidate, or candidates. This would be done by making contributions deductible—but within two strict limits.

One limit would be that in no event would the amount deductible exceed 2 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted